Appendix G.

Verbatim comments from online survey

Questions 1-7
1. Do you support more investment by your community and our region to make transit convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>Convenience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7089</td>
<td>Don't forget us in rural areas!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7236</td>
<td>Those areas especially outer southeast portland which does not have great transportation or accessible and affordable transport plus no sidewalks on busy streets such as powell blvd. that make it extremely dangerous to walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9702</td>
<td>I do not support Connect 3, (the rich apparently own our legislature) money being spent on airport improvements as &quot;alternative transportation&quot;. Middle class working citizens don't fly on corporate jets. Jet owners should fund their own projects. Connect 3 money should be spent on mass transit ONLY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9722</td>
<td>Cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Cost vs. profits. Trimet should not be given a monopoly provision on all busing and light rail. They do not know how to manage money or people in a safe or responsible manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Areas of highest density should have more frequent service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Conducting transportation studies by TriMet for adding bus lines where they presently don't exist, especially on the west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surface, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97004</td>
<td>Oregon City should be connected by light rail down 99E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97004</td>
<td>All areas should be covered by transit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 97005    | All transportation devices have unfinished wheels. Look at sidewalls of every tire. See the rubber hairs on sidewalls of auto and bicycle tires. The hairs have surface area, weight and mass (Physics). The surface area of hairs disturbs the air as wheel turns. The hairs travel faster than the car speed. Every wheel revolution it moves distance = circumference plus cycloic. Weight = save as the rubber of tire, wears pavement. Mass (Physics) = it has inertia. The hairs and rubber walls are a residue of manufacturing. If these residue is removed at manufacture the petroleum based rubber can be collected and properly disposed or recycled. If left on tire (as occurs today) the rubber shapes oppose all motion for the life of the tire. Tri-Met buses are made by GILLIG in HAYWARD, CALIF. GILLIG screws rectangles on a new bus. Tri-Met maintenance screws the ADVERTISING for a Calif. bus manufacturer on top of Oregon PUBLICLY OWNED gold plate with royal blue line boarder. The blue line is now covered. The metal rectangles on front and back plate are one-pound, 454 grams.. What wears pavement? Weight. For the life of the bus oxygen-fuel-tires-brakes-pavement are consumed to punt (football 404 g) CALIFORNIA BUS MANUFACTURER ADVERTISING. I observed GILLIG on bus in 1996. I phoned T-Met to ask "What is GILLIG?" The bus I
How far people have to walk to get to transit; parking near transit centers so people can combine driving and transit; frequent enough transit that it’s only a small time trade-off vs. driving.

Access for residential areas and parking at transit facilities.

Stable funding that allows transit to operate in a recession without cutting services. Portland needs a world class transit system, like San Francisco or Paris. It should support more than just commuting.

Ensuring that people without cars (especially low-income) have access to transportation. Also encouraging people with cars to use alternate transportation options.

Mobility of the general population, low-income and disabled specifically.

More parking structures along MAX routes. You can charge for parking. Buses can feed into MAX, but face it, Bus+MAX takes too much time. Increasing Car + MAX will boost MAX ridership, justifying increased frequency.

Where people live in relation to where they work.

Designing bike pathways that cut across busy streets or connect neighborhoods so families can safely travel by bike.

Prioritize transit on roadways, let them be first through signals, use center lanes to jump congestion, anything to provide more certainty in travel time. Consider barriers on light rail lines. Seems like almost daily interruptions of service. So many that confidence is waning.

Costs to local communities, security which is a big issue in expanding the MAX line.

Make sure there are convenient routes between suburbs.

All METRO employees should have to make a commitment (obviously within some parameters) to use transit, themselves. METRO employees who make more than $75K/year should be required to take pay cuts to fund better transit. METRO should hire its "management" from a pool of people who don't have "traditional" qualifications - but who are passionate about transportation and willing to work for less money.

I would love to take more public transportation but as of right now it takes me an hour to take the max to work and only 15 minutes to drive. Consider adding a max line that skips some stops to decrease the amount of time it takes to get down town.

Companies and their needs.

A key to accessibility for mass transit is access for cyclists and pedestrians. Closing the gaps in existing routes should be a top priority.

Parking for transit, especially Max, is limited. Especially long-term parking that would allow me to not drive to the airport.

Ways to reduce fares or offer family fares. Better bike/walk routes to transit stations. And please better (ie: more) bike facilities ON the train.

being fair to motorist. expanded transit is neede but not at the expense of taking away lanes or motorist rights.
Where major employers are located. If a bunch of workers can ride MAX but don’t have a good connection from the MAX stop to their place of work, it complicates their commute.

We need more bicycle, pedestrian, and NEV (neighborhood electric vehicles) lanes or paths. We could alleviate a great deal of road traffic and lower the need for parking spaces if we make low-energy alternatives truly attractive.

Convenience and cost compared to car travel.

Improving safety of access to stops and stations, and making the transit experience more enjoyable.

How many people benefit. Cost. Environment. I would like to see the red line Max start at Hillsboro and be at PDX by 4:30am since so many planes leave at 6 am. Creative solutions such as thru busses thru the daily bottlenecks on the roads. Safer walking and biking streets.

There is currently a problem with safety on Max. Policing of public transit can’t be ignored.

Convenience to central work places.

I support paying for public transit thru my property taxes and believe transit should be free to all residents.

funding, of course. I am willing to pay thru property taxes and at the gas pump–bet $7 gallon gas will get folks on transit. I believe that everyone who lives here should be able to use transit. Perhaps paying your taxes should result in transit passes. Perhaps there should be free or nearly free service for school kids. Staggered work shifts would help reduce traffic jams, both on the roads and the sometimes overfilled trains.

Access should include neighborhoods of current non-use, so no one has an easy excuse not to use transit. Access should be frequent enough that it competes reasonably with the immediacy of a car.

Do NOTHING that will increase property taxes. They are already unsustainable for many of us and getting worse.

Data based on ridership. I use public transportation and have a strong sense that more people than ever use MAX or ride buses. That kind of strong data in promoting bonds or other revenue sources as part of the campaign would be powerful.

Reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

I further believe that mass transit should be free to residents, funded by property, gasoline, and other taxes.

Mobility of job areas. Trains are great if you an guarantee that employers like Intel will always be exactly where they are. Bus rapid transit using the usual roads can respond quickly to changes.

How those public transportation resources can be timely when our roads are inadequate and chronically overcrowded.

Parking at transit locations, and destination of potential riders.
I’m already paying for TRIMET through my property taxes, yet no busses ride after 9pm and none at all on Sundays. The bus system is much too weak where I live to start rely on for more extensive commutes. Having them ride till midnight and at least once every other hour on Sundays could open up a new world for me. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income to subsidize public transportation. Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Run Max down the middle of Hwy 26 and connect all the communities on either side via foot/bike bridges. Have stops every half mile all the out to Hillsboro. Provide easy access to Intel campuses.

Who uses transit and from what areas. How often there is a need for transit.

People are much less likely to use public transportation if it isn’t convenient and frequent. No one wants to make more than one transfer, and no one wants to wait more than 15 minutes for a bus or train.

Conditions of the locations where people wait for transit. Ensure they are well lit and covered to make waiting more comfortable since our climate is frequently wet and safety can be a concern.

Equity of access.

Interconnections within the system that enable rapid cross region commuting.

Buses to start 0400 rather than 0500 Monday to Friday, I work 4 days a week at the Portland VA and live in Aloha near 185th/kinnaman rd. I carpool 50 percent of the time would love to take the bus.

Commuting is time sensitive. For me to get to the airport takes so long when using mass transit; virtually makes it useless for me.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

Also include investment in road improvements and new road construction for increased vehicle traffic which will result as the population increases.

We HAVE to stop ignoring the inevitability of runaway green house effect leading to climate change that life cannot survive. Massive financial investments are the only way forward.

The environment.

Reaching out to locations with no or inconvenient service.

Cut down driving.

For me having more biking routes separated from traffic would be most beneficial.

bicycle and pedestrian safety are top concerns.

Reducing overall emissions, more diesel buses does not achieve this overriding goal.

How to provide for the greatest number of end users at the best cost.

More routes (MAX/WES and bus) and better service/frequency to outlying areas so that commuting by mass transit is feasible for those of outside of Portland proper.

It should focus on lower income areas that would benefit most from easier access to more jobs.
Poorer people often live on the outer edges of the suburbs, where bus service is least frequent. This forces them to rely on cars, because buses simply aren’t an option for getting across town in a timely way. 

Infill and reuse real estate near existing public transportation routes for mixed use that combines 0 and 1 bd housing for young and old with and locate additional food and healthcare options nearby. Continue to build network of local and active transportation routes, trails, wayfinding signs etc that link to public transportation. Corporate incentives for telecommuting or low impact travel to work. More jobs near transit centers.

people and environmental sustainability.

TriMet should be adequately funded particularly if their fares were to be reduced.

Dedicated bike trails.

Lower the cost of ridership on transit.

In our aging population, I would suggest considerations of access that accommodates these people.

It needs to be convenient or people won’t use it.

Balancing equity with accessibility—not just putting money and resources toward improving areas with high need, but also letting people in outlying areas have options for travelling.

Effectiveness—including cost-effectiveness, future impact on local and regional population densities, aggressive action aimed at employers (and home buyers) to reduce commuting distances, realistic acknowledgement of SUBURBAN transportation needs, safety of all elements (walkers, bikers, motorists), environmental impact.

Frequent public transportation service in the Beaverton area, n such thoroughfares as Hall Blvd and Scholls Ferry Road.

Trimet’s ability. it does not use its resources well.

I think we need to consider building less housing so we aren’t so congested.

Having a plan to get more people out of their cars and onto transit and trails. How do you get people to use it if roads keep getting expanded?

Need to really make sure the cost is justified by the amount of use... How many people use it? Concern that I as a homeowner am being taxed out of my home. Taxes have made it very difficult to continue living here in Beaverton.

Use of electric or hybrid buses. Increase availability of express buses with few stops to help speed commutes.

How to move the greatest number of people in the shortest amount of time while not ignoring the needs for transit of rural areas.

Costs to taxpayers.
Moving the greatest number of people in the shortest amount of time while not ignoring those who live and work in outlying areas, especially those with limited transportation options, e.g. medically fragile, economically deprived, or otherwise handicapped individuals.

Biggest bang for the buck.

Connectivity with bedroom communities not normally included in plans. Many lower income people live in the suburbs and would benefit from transit.

More transit service in "outskirts" of the Metro...a lot of people commute into the area.

Make connections convenient. People do not want to add an hour or more to their commute due to having to make a transfer location that is in the opposite direction from where they want to go.

Road maintenance, rural areas.

Tax incentives to encourage behavior and help establish better habits.

Add more freeways like the Sunrise and MT hood freeway needs to be built east of the metro area.

Higher frequency of mass transit trips will lead to more people willing to use the system. It has to be dependable with a short waittime where ever you get on.

Environment.

Attracting more car riders to use mass transit more often.

EMISSIONS FROM CARS AND TRUCK SHOULD BY IMPLEMENT BY 2015 NOT WAIT TO 2935 THAT IS TO LONG AND PUT MORE GAS TAX ON GASS AND DIESEL.

Areas of lower income households, sidewalks to safely walk to and from transit routes, viable connections between routes.

Traffic patterns and trips.

There is currently no reasonable route from Clackamas Town Center/Outside of Portland to the south waterfront. The time it takes to get somewhere has a bigger effect than the price of the fares.

I don't know.

Population growth !

The balance of general support (i.e. tax support and subsidy) and ridership contribution is a key issue. I do not support expansion at any cost, and particularly eager to see a balance of contributions from all riders, with special offsets for indigent and low income.

Unsure.

Less track building and better bus service.

Allocate money for it.

Public comment and vote if tax is requested for funding.

Safety, accessibility to all areas of metro, parking that is policed a bit more closely.

Safety is a huge concern, both from traffic, and pedestrians intent on doing harm.
We should be concentrating more on North South transportation than East West.

More light rail, streetcars, trains for intercity travel.

Coordinate & synchronize timing of all public transportation using digital technology, as implemented in the European public transportation system. Easy access to p.t. Schedules---traditional phone, computer, smart phone apps.

Light rail needs to be part of this mix even though some are trying to stop further expansion.

I find that local opposition to rail is a huge impediment to providing regional access.

Neighborhood density, affordability, convenience.

How to improve the transportation system we have and move towards a much greater use of non car system! Our trains don't work in the heat, in the cold, are easily damaged by vandals. Bike lanes although some of the best in the country should be better, more encompassing forcing new generations to make it their choice. Amsterdam has an awesome transit system and should be studied as an excellent choice for Portland and the surrounding area. Cars are the least used. They are smaller, and bikes being the #1 choice. Buses, trains, walking, all make for a system that with help and leadership from OR govt could work here. I have been there several times and it is Portland in The Netherlands. Many similarities, weather and waterways and bridges included. I hope WE have learned from the Cover Oregon debacle, and the Interstate Bridge disaster to reach out to those who have been successful in a project and not stand on our own ignorance when we can't figure it out.

Only if bus/bicycle/pedestrian transit improvements DON'T take monies away from road/ automobile needs. Also, attempt to separate bicycle and automobile traffic. An increase in bicycle transportation convenience, if interactive with automobiles, is just more opportunity for minimally "poor relations" between the two and maximally death and serious damage to bicyclists.

Building more freeway lanes. It's incredible that no lanes have been added here in 30 years.

Make cost fair and equitable for all citizens: elders, children, low income.

The reality is the roads now are very inefficient and crowded, and with the projected growth for PDX metro it might be time to think about building new and better roads that incorporate all means of transit including autos.

Complex issues need more than simple survey questions. Tri-Met needs to reduce labor / benefit costs in order to maintain and expand service. Service needs to be reliable. Too often even on high frequency routes buses don't come. It obviously difficult for citizens to commit to transit I they can't get to work on time. Maintenance dollars need to be prioritized as well.

It should be efficient and easy to use for to as many commuters as possible.

Usability of public transit.

Frequency of stops.
Sidewalks would be nice in neighborhoods so people could walk their errands and there would be fewer school buses.

Bike safety for routes in/out of Portland (i.e. Macadam needs a shoulder).

Bikers expose themselves to terrible risks from cars because they seem to think the drivers will see and avoid them. But they should have training to learn the rules of the road (stop as stop signs, for example) and learn about safety. Also, I think we should have gone for more buses and not make such a big bet on light rail. The ridership certainly does not justify the enormous investment being made. The third point I would make is to be more aware of the cost/benefit analysis when thinking about more public transportation projects. I really doubt that some of these would pass an economic sniff test.

Neighborhood impact, need, environmental impact.

Long term investment.

Safety. Connecting population centers (ex. Lake Oswego and Sellwood). Provide multi-modal options (bike to train). Transit times. People don't want to take the train if it doubles their commute time.

Highest use routes, high congestion areas, access for all neighborhoods.

Safe routes for bikes and pedestrians.

More bus lines in underserved communities.

More frequent bus service metro wide. Way to much is being invested in light rail to the detriment of what used to be a great bus system.

We should do everything we can to reduce people’s reliance on card and ensure that biking and walking are safe, viable options. I see this as one of the most important tasks we face as a community.

Make sure that the largest # of people will be impacted.

Fast public transit like light rail, subway.

Population growth, getting cars off the freeway and increasing frequency during peak hours.

Consider high traffic shopping areas, not just work day commuters.

Don't waste money trying to force public transportation systems onto people that don't ever want it.

Other competing interests.

Sidewalks/pathways on main routes to bus stops.

Fast mass transit.

Outreach to employers, employees, educators and students to determine needed and desired routes.

Demographics, Landuse patterns, Economics.

Expansion of transit routes.

Impacts to private property... property owners need to understand the positive value that such infrastructure will bring!
You need to be careful not to take away from one option to expand another option. Bike paths and walking paths should not be destroyed to make room for transit.

Adequate "first and last mile" capacity.

Telecommuting should be included in any planning.

Getting people from their homes to places they need to go in a timely manner to eliminate the desire to use their car for the trip rather than public transit.

Affordability and usefulness to low-wage workers, and suitability as a sole means of transport for non-driving, carless folks.

Add more suburb to suburb express lines by expanding max and/or adding express buses - eliminate long transfer times as much as possible. Make transit a high priority and eliminate free parking by employers. Parking fees should help fund transit as should a local gas tax and/or per mile tax. Also, lets have more people work from home or the local cafe one or more days per week to cut down on the number of sovs on the road. We need a world class transit system and we are falling behind.

Put money back into public transit. Buses remain the option for many, many people. What a mistake to raise fares and limit lines. Underwrite public transit as a public service, not a business.

Cost to the community.

Taxing only citizens that can benefit. Communities where it would be used the most.

Extending MAX to Clackamas Community College. Less cars, more bikes and buses in the next decade. It's the future.

Getting more cars off the road and adding services for low income people.

Linking multi-modal routes and increasing bus service.

More light rail access.

How to increase walkability, biking, and public transit in all metro areas, not just in Portland.

Where to encourage growth as it is influenced by transit, least long term cost to the region.

A sales tax.

Affordable housing near transportation centers. The majority of folks live in neighborhoods where public transportation is not convenient. With that being stated more public transportation routes.

The residents' desire for rapid transit, which is not necessarily the same as the governmental overseers that "make decisions" for them.

Local, non TriMet buses.

Making workplaces more flexible and bringing living-wage jobs to the neighborhoods.

Smaller buses, available more often.

To work along with those who still need to transit by car.

Cost.
Placing transit where it will reach the most people AND help reduce traffic.

How to connect areas in the suburbs to make it easier (ie. Oregon City to Portland, lightrail further out...).

Stop paying $200,000,000 a mile for trains that provide NO EXPRESS Service...It is faster to use bus service to get where I need to go vs the rail system.

Light rail needs to be expanded to include Oregon City and possibly Wilsonville.

Bicycling.

Existing rails.

All the reasons people have for not using transit.

Safety, accessibility.

Gas tax should be designated for road maintenance and construction only. Other funding source should be used for bike and walking pathway such as a bike registration fee.

Make sure that the less fortunate communities have good frequent bus service and safe walking lanes with good lighting. When I was reliant on the bus service, my children were very young and safe, lit bus stops and frequent service was SO important for our safety.

Parking is at a premium and people are and will use alternative transportation if affordable and available. People will go to other arras shopping, visiting if transportation is there. Tourist will love it no map reading, getting lost and easy travel through the area and beyond. The possibilities are endless.

Making transit safe for all ages at all times of the day.

When the price of fuel skyrockets, mass transit will be the future. tax break for hybrid vehicles hybrid buses and government vehicles.

Don't forget the east side. It would be great to have a MAX train that comes out to Troutdale.

Connectivity intra region, allowing the system to be a combination of intra community connections as well as access to the Portland hub.

Population density.

Safety.

Quite frankly, whether we like it or not, it's a necessity.

Just do it! But do it economically, safely, and environmentally sound.

The general needs of the public.

Put in stops at major destinations so that people don't have to walk several blocks in deserted areas after riding Max.

Example: Menlo Station in Beaverton out in the middle of nowhere and the station at 60th Ave. instead of right at Providence hospital. Same at Providence St. Vincent. Why is the Max stop so far from the major, anchor business?
Making transit more convenient, and LESS of a traffic hazard! Currently, TriMet buses stop in the middle of streets, right next to busy intersections, causing traffic delays AND creating hazards, in addition to the hazards created by frustrated drivers diving around the buses (as obstacles). I’d like to see more curb indentions where buses could pull out of traffic to pick up and discharge passengers, especially those with disabilities or loading/unloading bicycles, etc.

Consideration of different communities within the Metro area, recognizing that the periphery does not have the same transportation goals as the Pearl District.

Other items of importance.

The areas that are currently not serviced and infrequent service at other times.

Community environment....... preserve the reasons why the people of the community live where they do.

Better weekend service from Tualatin into downtown Portland.

Access to downtown Portland from the suburbs at extended hours. I would like to go into Portland for a day of shopping or for dinner and events, then return home without having to drive in rush hour traffic or wait for a bus for an hour or longer. Light rail would be great.

I can't understand why cities like mine vote to stop the city from spending money on mass transit without a public vote? And the drive from pdx to Tualatin in over an hour during "rush" hour. Why do people think mass transit is wrong? We need more info to learn why it is better.

Suburban areas need better access to consistent mass transit. It's so dumb to not be able to take WES or a bus downtown except at rush hour times. I would LOVE to take the train downtown in the evenings but that is not available.

That the region not just Portland MUST have GOOD transportation options within each city and connecting each city/region TO the Portland downtown area. BOTH are very, very important!

Cost and transit time. Over an hour on transit commute is no solution.

Mostly, I think we need to consider the outer suburbs and their access to all parts of the metro area. Except for a very few bus lines, mostly we are left with trains and buses that only run during rush hours. I really want to be able to use mass transit to get downtown for evenings out.

More lanes and roads.

I think more walking and bike trails would be helpful. I think we need more "green boxes" at intersections all through the metro area.
First, I want mutually reinforcing transit policy and development regulations, meaning I want more transit and realize it takes corridors and nodes to do that, but the 'burbs of the region sprawl -- yes, within the urban growth boundary, but they still sprawl -- still build not enough housing types other than single-family (duplexes, townhouses, apartment courts, apartments above shops), not enough affordable housing, and still too much surface parking and too much segregation of daily activities -- and of people too. I want the 'burbs to build more like Portland so I can say with a straight face that I can and will ride fast, frequent, and pervasive transit through the region, from the 'burbs downtown and from suburb to suburb. Naysaying suburban homeowners don't speak for me! Second, as part of item 1, I want to see the state and Metro lead (and perhaps fund) redevelopment of the region's strip malls and arterial auto sewers to create mixed-use places worth being (and traveling to and from) where they don't yet exist. I want to see "complete streets".

Reality. We seriously need to expand our freeway system, especially I-5 through the center of Portland. Also, we need to decentralize our transportation system to take advantage of web-based ride sharing systems.

Utilize to decrease car/truck traffic on major roadways.

Long-term strategy for reducing congestion, improving air quality and rewarding carbon emission reduction.

Be efficient with the money.

Affordability and access.

The Union cost to operate the transit system are unsustainable. I would support this approach if the transit system was financially sustainable.

Look at the choke points in the metro area and figure out how to make them flow. Then look at places that aren't serviced, but have low-income and need transit.

Where people live, work and shop for essentials - - food.

cost versus benefit.

Numbers of people served, levels of congestion, most efficient and effective solution, use of already existing infrastructure, such as rail lines in Lake Oswego and Oregon City.

Cost and accessibility.

Frequent routes, size of transport vehicles. Ie size the vehicle for the amount of usage, so more minibusses and also electric vehicles.

Safe bike lines.

Multi-modal considerations - adequate bicycle space on buses.

Reality. We need more freeway lanes.

We need to make transit more frequent, reliable, accessible and more affordable.

Convenient travel from all parts of the Metro area to all other parts, not just to Portland.
If we're talking about regional transit then it truly needs to be regional. Help the suburbs connect with other suburbs and help transit systems connect with other transit systems so that it is seamless for the user.

More local control of implementation. Local decision makers understand the specific issues of a community better.

To make transit truly convenient it must be reasonably available during off-peak and non-work day time periods. People cannot be expected to rely upon transit if it is only available for peak hour travel.

Pedestrian (bicyclists included) emphasized planning. Get more personal vehicles out of the neighborhood travelways.

Expanding the current insufficient road system without light rail.

Tri-Met needs to go away and smaller regional transit systems to need exist that will feed light rail and make the system sustainable.

More transit on area freeways.

Access to shopping malls, colleges, large employers park and ride; bike and ride.

The needs of both working and non-working populations (like retirees). Schedule transit for WEEKENDS.

More consistent scheduling linkage between TriMet and SMART (South Metro Area Regional Transit).

The aging population; those who don't drive due to specific disabilities; and, students who don't have/can't afford cars. Low-cost or free public transportation should be geared towards them. Signs in Braille and voice info for the active blind, free boarding for specific routes serving areas with a majority of elderly, reduced fares for students under age 24, free or reduced fares for disabled with a doctor's validation. For the employed, more routes at peak times so they can easily get to/from work; greatly reduced rates for monthly/semi-annual/annual passes. Plain-clothes cops or security guards on night routes and routes that pass through crime-ridden areas. More sheltered bus stops (it rains here!) Free transfers between cities/transit systems.

Consider the places people need to go and the timing of most trips.

Obtain sufficient funding for light rail expansion. We should set our goals to match the superb system in places like Boston or Wash, DC.

Better connect between TriMet and SMART. On weekdays TriMet Bus 96 gets me to 95th & Commerce Circle (Wilsonville) at 2:15 pm, and the next SMART bus picks up at that location at 3:30 pm. I could walk to almost anywhere in Wilsonville by then.

Sidewalks.

Safety of passengers at night.
Do not forget about the entire region, not just the Portland area. The major expansions of South Hillsboro and South Cooper Mountain are going to severely strain the transportation system. Neither of these projects are near light-rail and bus service is non-existent. How are you going to move thousands of new residents out of the two areas? TV HWY and Farmington Road are at capacity. Driving down Scholls-Ferry is a nightmare.

I'd like to bike to work but lack of sidewalks and bike lanes in Beaverton (SW 198th, SW 209, SW Farmington Rd Kinneman to 198th & over Cooper Mountain) make it a pipe dream. Too much traffic and not enough safe pedestrian/bike routes.

Look at all economic aspects of the transit provider. For example, we hear that Tri-Met will be out of money in several years. Choose transit providers that are viable and sustainable.

Consider using incentive programs to increase ridership, e.g. a bus or max ticket doubles as a lottery ticket; five tickets gets a rider a free coffee; a monthly pass comes with a chance to win a week's worth of groceries.

Don't overbuild transit facilities to the detriment of autos.

Long haul passenger trains.

Accessing transit, I live beyond public transit system, and I live within the urban growth district.

Primarily--economic level of communities. Communities with fewer options (e.g., low levels of car ownership) should have higher access to public transportation. Budgetary considerations are important, but access to transportation is more important than income from any particular route.

Walkers and bikers do not pay for these benefits via gas taxes. If we successfully encourage more folks to walk and bike, how will we pay for the cost of their walkways/paths, bridges, etc.? It does not seem fair to require only the car drivers to pay for the other methods of transportation.

Adding routes/frequency to serve areas not currently serviced by public transit within a reasonable and safe walk.

Fix the streets before you fix anything else!

Underserved areas.

East county seems to be lagging behind in some of these areas, Accessibility in Eastern Multnomah County, Gresham and Sandy could be enhanced as well as frequency of bus service.

Timing of traffic lights... currently pretty poor, especially during peak commute times.

Users should be asked what works and doesn't. Updates for delays would provide more options.

Cover areas that currently have no transit access. For example, from my home I need to walk a half-mile to a bus stop but the bus that serves that stop does not come often and stops too early for me to use it at night, resulting in a 2-mile walk from MAX. Coverage is not good enough in outlying areas.

Service to unserved/underserved areas. Expanding safe walking and bike routes to access transit.

Each areas different needs, future projections according to uses bikes, smart traffic lights and transit access.

How many people will make use of the options.
Better east-west traffic FLOW east of 205. Morning and evening commuters should NOT have to stop at every stop light heading east and west. Time the lights, and make pullouts for the busses. Don't have a bus stop every block, or if you do, only stop there half the times.  

Whether it resulted in fewer people living in a different place than they work. Options, cost and think long term.  

When MAX or other high capacity rapid transit is established in an area, make sure that neighborhoods maintain at least the preexisting level of public transit service.  

Safety and reliability.  

TriMets poor performance.  

N/A  

I really think safe biking and walking trails and sidewalks to grocery stores, schools, and work should be first on the list. Providing convenient service to the largest population. The natural flow of commuters with the strategic use of hubs to move people most quickly and efficiently.  

I think demographics are important here. The younger groups only think about how fast they can get around. Older folks are worried that if they give up their current mode of transportation (automobile) will they ever be able to get around? Long-term vision of structure, ease of change/adaptability with technological/environmental growth.  

Combination of light rail, bus service and road expansion. It will take more than sweet talk to make some of our local communities take this seriously. Carrots and sticks will be needed by the state etc.  

Make transit use feel safer. I love MAX and appreciate that it functions as an affordable option for many people but often feel that many people who use it lack an understanding of appropriate behavior and the trains are not patrolled. I have been jabbed with a knife and had to endure loud cursing and aggressive behavior from other passengers. If this behavior was brought under control I'd be much more likely to use transit. Location Needs of all and not just the most vocal.  

Taking private land should be held to a minimum. Make it safe, clean, and convenient, so that rich people will end up riding. Have someone aboard the conveyance other than the driver who can take fares, give, and keep order. Designate more streets as "through traffic for busses only."--traffic jams for cars only.  

Public Transit does not serve all areas of metro - Banks/North Plains. Rethinking light-rail implementation to include express options. The original implementation was short-sighted and counter-productive.
Mass transit is one of the best ways to reduce congestion and emissions.

Be fair and equitable. Don’t push social agendas.

If you follow the triple bottom line of sustainable thinking, it will serve you well in your decision making.

Security of mass transit. Elderly do not like to ride MAX or tri-met due to safety concerns.

For me, the most essential criteria in deciding to use public transit is time - it must get me from home to my destination in very little more time than it would take to drive. So increasing frequency would probably be my first issue to address.

Time/expense ratio needs to be considered, as well as the distance traveled for family wage jobs. Some increased commute times is reasonable for the benefits of using public transportation. Present systems more than double some commute times, and this will not move people out of cars.

It would be beneficial to bring light rail to Forest Grove - it would be a much more efficient way to get to downtown Portland.

Travel data, especially trips to work. Promotion of flexible work schedules. Options like the loop bus in Forest Grove. Park and ride at the end of the bus lines, plus incentives for people far from transit to drive to the park and ride rather than to their destination inside Portland or the other cities.

Buses are much more effective than trains at moving people, especially considering they can go anywhere, they are not tied to a specific track line. I would rather see dedicated bus lanes on major roads and highways than more MAX lines.

Greatest greenhouse gas reduction.

Environment & wildlife.

Public Transportation that is easy to access.

Important, but maintaining existing transportation infrastructure should be the top priority. Do not take resources away from road maintenance to make NEW investments in transit. Find new resources for transit, preferably from large employers and transit users.

Speed of transit is an important factor. If it takes someone an hour to drive to work in their personal vehicle, but 2 hours to take public transit, it doesn't matter how often the trains or busses come or how much it costs, many people aren't going to use it.

People need more frequent and efficient public transportation.

Cost vs. Benefit, Personal Safety on transit. If transients significantly outnumber commercial commuter traffic then transit is not a safe and viable option for commuters.

Support the whole region - we especially need to reduce the number of stops since it takes forever to get anywhere by transit!
Where people live, where they work, where they go for leisure and entertainment, doctors, cultural centers, etc. Hours of operation should take into consideration not just work and school hours, but shopping, dining and night time events as well.

Population density - higher density gets more transit/stops/frequency

NOT the will of the voters-- look how bad Tigard and Tualatin have it, and now rail may never get there!

Fairs should not be artificially kept low with taxpayer monies. It should cost what it cost s to ride.

Focus on community oriented transit to supplement TriMet service.

People's transportation needs, not Tri-Met management's misplaced priorities.

Rail lines to extend further in distance, not just connect more close-in areas.

IMPACT  _ Efficiency and practicality - How can we reduce drives from Intel areas to the PDX airport - NOT by a 2 hour frequent stop and CHANGE TRAINS system. Needs a fast track train with maybe 6-8 stops only NO transfer of luggage.

Where people live, work and play, the times people need and want public transportation available, keeping fares reasonable, especially for low income, seniors and disabled people, make trains and buses accessible to everyone and run routes as frequently as possible.

Safe places to park vehicles, bikes, scooters that you might use to get to a transit stop.

Getting conservaties on board so that they understand this need. Finding conservatives who actuall bike, walk and use transit systems. Get them to work within their communitites for better access.

Light rail is expensive and limited by rails. Investments should be made buses and increased routes and quicker service times with more express rides. A big problem with transit is wait times and lack of safety.

Travel times must be competitive with the auto mode. More emphasis on rapid transit. Skip stop service or stop elimination should be considered, along with priority and exclusive running.

location of stops, connection/safety in walking/biking to as well as destinations.

Convenience is key, as is access. In weighing the costs and benefits of taking HCT, convenience is the #1 factor for many.

Safety and affordability.

Current usage and poential usage.

Discounts for people buying monthly or yearly passes. Expanding the light rail line on the west side. More north south lines that would meet up with the blue and red lines.

Population growth areas, areas without adequate transit, improved transit service.

Access to those most in need of transit.

How to encourage more people to commute; providing more and better park and ride options (that are not liable to be full by the time you get there), and easy ways for people to get to their destinations from the last transit point.
Safety and can't afford to reduce cost too much.... currently, I feel it's not dependable enough/flexible enough, nor safe enough to use with our kids...1 with a medical condition which is not physically apparent.

Employment locations in relation to residential areas to encourage commuter use.

More people should be able to work go to school or shop without a private car.

Cost and location of the community members to be able to access the transit options.

More $$ for roads.

Consider using technology to provide some frequency increases based on demand - not just scheduling a bus every half hour with 3 people on it.

Accessibility, increased frequency, more options for bike riders who combine with public transit, affordability.

Make walking more feasible-better sidewalk system that is continuous.

What the cost will be to tax payers and users of the system.

Walking and waiting in the rain and the dark.

Area of service, events, connections (such as bus for max or train).

I think that incentivizing and convincing people to use transit is important. Some people are needlessly afraid of it and so they drive instead.

Make public transit comfortable and less crowded so that people will choose it as the best option. I take Max downtown in the middle of the day for meetings and love it. (I work in Hillsboro) I dread taking it home at rush hour.

Expanding timing. Too much of Trimet's schedule is in support of Mon-Fri 8-5 workers. Shift workers and weekend workers are out of luck. Folks without cars are unable to take available jobs outside of Trimet hours.

Washington Co needs to provide a safe route from Hillsboro TC to Banks so people can ride their bikes out to the Linear Trail. West Union Rd is no longer a safe place to ride so Wren Rd is the safest but it has NO SHOULDER. I don't need a bike lane, just give me a road with a shoulder that will take me from Hillsboro to Banks without wondering when I'm going to get run down by someone who is talking on their cell phone while driving 20mph over the speed limit.

A reduced family fare could encourage more mass transit use and introduce more children to the TriMet system earlier, fostering continued use as teens and adults. Safe transit connections in many cases will require safer street crossings at stop locations without traffic lights.

Consider using more, but smaller buses that can more readily be deployed on less-popular routes and with more frequent service. I see a lot of buses that are mostly empty. If you could run a smaller bus twice as often, you might improve ridership.
Make transit more convenient and frequent for those of us who could or would like to use it in non-peak hours such as midday and weekends when service is now frequently curtailed.

Suburban and near rural areas are poorly served by non-auto transit currently. Bike lanes or on-demand transit should be considered on rural trunk routes.

Because the population of seniors is due to increase in the future, I have concern that transit service won't be accessible or safe for seniors.

Less spending on high profile but limited use transit, more on frequent, comprehensive, extensive bus services.

Buses only.

Consider other transit needs besides just to and from work; families, older folks, teens, all could use public transit, walk and/or bike to appointments, social activities, events in downtown, if schedules and safety considered their needs.

The MAX line should be more regular and convenient. Bikes should be licensed to pay for the paint to mark their lanes. Electric cars should pay a fee to make up for the lack of gasolines taxes for road repair.

That not all transit riders have access to an automobile for any part of their journey so transit must be made accessible for those without alternatives; it needs to reach all of the metro area, all events, and run with frequency at all times of day, night and weekends so that all members of the community can participate in the community.

Our road systems are broken. Before we invest in more mass transit solutions that are under-utilized, we need to make our roads wider and enable people who work to get there! Also, reducing the amount of stopped traffic on freeways is the ONLY way to reduce emissions. We waste thousands of gallons of fuel and create tons of emissions because our roads don't work.

Look for ways to combine forms of transportation, like walking or biking with transit, easier to do. Doing this well can solve the "last mile" problem that folks often run into when taking busses or trains.

More bike lanes and bike paths connecting communities and cities.

Cut back on light rail and trolley spending. Increase spending for buses.

Frequency and reliability of service. Also, make the system economically sound so transit riders don't get shafted when the economy tanks.

Consider all aspects of transit--commuting for work, visiting, shopping, recreation.

Making it easy, convenient, frequent for people to use at all times do day, week, month!
Portland was never built for the numbers of people we’ll be attracting over the next 20 years, and we have have a huge backlog of deferred maintenance infrastructure projects. Reducing wear and tear on roads by making driving less attractive seems like a great way to reduce wear and tear and eliminate the need for new roadway/highway projects or widening projects. Also, most people move here for the good air and quality of life. More cars means bad air, and DEQ’s stats reflect that our downtown is in some areas many hundreds of times more polluted than benchmark levels for respiratory health. If I had my way, cars would be banned in the downtown core. They are more expense and trouble than they are worth and they waste a lot of space.

Adequate bus service in areas not well served by light rail.
Policies that reduce automobile trips.
Cost to riders, replacement of schedules which have been critically reduced--take a look at the "commuter" lines first

Equity.
Getting people with limited incomes from underserved neighborhoods to where there are jobs.
Channeling people east and west in Tigard. A lot of people live there, but the transit system is focused on north-south trips. Because houses are far from bus stops, people drive.
How does it work for people who don’t have many resources? (I’d love better bus service in my SW Hills neighborhood and I’d use it to work and shop if it went where I needed it to go when I needed it to go there--like weekends. But the fact is that I can afford a car and I can drive where I want to go and there are people in Portland who cannot so I’d make them the first priority for transport policy).
Walking and biking lanes, expand buses.
Value and return on investment. For instance, buses are more flexible and a better value than continuing to build trams, street cars, and MAX lines.
Stimulating development, improved access to jobs, new community and regional transit connections.
Bring back the fare-free square! Both locals and tourists loved it, and it was the first exposure that many Portlanders got to mass transit.
Money.
Determine how high the thresholds of these 4 qualities need to be to make community transit of all types overcome lone auto drivers, especially in suburbs.
Use current tax dollars at the local and state level and leverage the private-nonprofit community for ideas in a collaborative manner.
How fast it can be implemented. The sooner the better.
Better public transit is an absolute must for outlying areas where the bulk of low-income people live. Cars are expensive, jobs pay low-wages, housing closer-in to the City is unaffordable. Public transit is really the only viable option for equity and livability in the region. This is my highest priority on this survey.
Providing a baseline service to all parts of the community AND providing additional service where there's demand. I.e. parallel to what we do for cars (basic street grid plus arterial/highways where needed).

More people use cars, public transit, or walk than use bicycles so investment should be directed to those areas.

Providing reliable and diverse transportation alternatives.

How to maximize ridership. Should a second MAX rail be installed for express trains? -How to connect the less moneyed to the places they need to travel: home, work, grocery stores, libraries, schools -How to make it easier to get to our parks and recreation centers. -Staying available late night, to offer ridership as an alternative to driving under the influence.

Affordability is what prevents me from taking buses most of the time. 2.50 to go 6 blocks is excessive in my opinion.

The hotspots where more transport is lacking.

Improve the bus system and do not waste anymore money on the rail system.

Return the fareless square area to PDX and eliminate fares wherever possible. Fares are a waste of time, money and effort. Financing s/b via common progressive taxation as public transit benefits everyone in the region, even those who do not use it directly.

Walkability of neighborhoods, especially currently underserved communities and communities where transit service has been scaled back or cut in the recent past.

Transit funding should be stabilized and not subject to economic cycles. During down economic cycles is just the time when public transit is most needed.

I think that reduced fares for low income people and students would be nice.

Policy that makes walking in neighborhoods easier for people to walk to work, stores, community centers and to cross busy streets. Make mass transit simpler to use, cheaper, and transfer. Pedestrian and bike 'malls'. Fees on new cars, registration and gas.

Increasing frequency of both buses and max trains every day of the week. Getting around on the weekends can be particularly challenging.

by transit, i presume you mean mass transit not individual transit? 1. eliminate all cars from portland downtown & lloyd center 2. make completely separate bike routes. bikes & cars don't mix. 3. portland's a hilly city. plan the bike routes to stay as level as possible. 4. eliminate all bussing of children to school let them WALK. 5. Using a zoning system around the central area distribute bike valets & car parking lots & use shuttles or teach people how to walk. keep bikes out of central area. walking only.

Improve public transportation options to cross the Sellwood bridge and travel to Lewis & Clark College.
Connect where people live, especially areas with many lower income families and/or older people, with where they need to go - work, community colleges, schools, health care centers. TriMet tickets should last for 3 hours.

Serving low income communities.

Increasing access for disadvantaged/low income communities (in terms of location and when transit is available), affordability, and safety. I am especially interested in seeing Metro invest in safe ped/bike infrastructure around transit/bus lines to support safely getting to transit services, and to support multi-model transit around the region.

Linking to biking/walking infrastructure and fare abatement should be highest priorities.

Keeping the cost as affordable as possible for the benefit of low income users.

Making more direct walking and bicycle facilities such as crosswalks, safety signs and signals, bike lanes and bicycle parking posts to lock bikes safely, to prevent bicycle theft.

When investing in infrastructure understanding how those investments will affect affordability of transport for people who are low income and/or living in low income neighborhoods. Priority should be given to those communities in terms of accessibility and affordability and ensure affordable housing is not being affected.

When people choose what sort of transit to use they look at the convenience to them (do they have the time to bicycle? Do they have rain gear and feel comfortable using it?, their familiarity and comfort with the mode (how much have they bicycled, are they in good shape or will they break a seat or mess up their hair) and whether it will accomplish their goal (can they carry their suit case and work clothes with them? Can they carry their groceries, including impulse buys, home with them?). The crucial part of helping more and more people bicycle, take the train and bus, and walk is to make sure it feels convenient and meets their goals. Of these, the hardest is the daily commute - more and more frequent busses are the solution. But when the bus and bicycle are used to grocery shop and take the kids to soccer practice, that is when you have accomplished your goal. Frequency matters the most, and for that you will have to fire the Trimet Board and hire some people who understand that bus service should feel like a luxury product; fast, frequent, clean, and pleasant on the senses.

Impacts of vehicle congestion caused by conflicts with the bicycle mode slowing down transit headways.

Cost benefit analysis of proposed projects. Moving bicycles off of heavily travelled boulevards (e.g. SE Hawthorne).

Traffic patterns and peak times more connections so that it takes less time to reach destinations alternative bike routes that are safe and don't compete with cars/trucks - family friendly safe bicycle parking.

All aspects listed above.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Frequency of service, speed, location, and cost.
I agree with this strategy and want a study done to ensure that changes make sense. For example, SE Holgate from 205 to 122nd was modified to allow for bike traffic. This was done by reducing the available car lanes from 4 to 2. I drive this stretch of road frequently and have yet to see the bike lane being utilized. I would like to see thoughtful changes made that are truly needed and WANTED by the community utilizing it. Neighborhood associations should be deployed to speak with citizens and identify real needs vs. What we think that community should do/have.

Cost, population density, stop reducing auto traffic lanes.
Cars are not as important and actually rob communities of their vitality.
Safety at stops, increasing frequency in employment zones with limited parking, incentives to employers to provide transit benefits to employees
The long-term price of oil will go up. We need to conserve it.
I believe BRT is much better than streetcars that run on rails. Less expensive, less dangerous for bicyclists, more adaptable to changes.
Actual ridership and determining which routes and frequencies - rush hour and other times need to be changed.
Bus Rapid Transit! I understand that maybe developers like the certainty of street cars and light rail, but that costs way too much for too little service in return. Bus rapid transit with dedicated lanes is more efficient and much cheaper than an underfunded and undermanned rail system. Make the busses nicer and the stigma will go away - like bolt bus/touring bus style. Short of that, frequency is an under-estimated factor of overall accessibility. 1-hour between arrivals discourages system use and makes round-trips on single fares impossible. Safety is the biggest psychological factor keeping people from riding bikes anymore. Dedicated facilities will help more riders. Callahan vicinity food stores will help make riders feel safe.
Populations with financial challenges.
Cost efficiency. For example, don't build transit systems that are not used.
Increasing the frequency is not enough, busses need to run early, they need to run late, they need to run on weekends. TriMet needs to provide service early mornings, EVEN ON WEEKENDS.
Better integrating more forms of transportation: bike parking at main bus and rail hubs.
Whatever you build needs to not interfere with vehicular use. Stop congesting the streets with bike lanes, light rail signals, sidewalk and corner bumpouts. Car divers pay the taxes for these roads and should have right of way. THAT would decrease congestion.
Combining it with walking options to get to the stops. More walking to fewer stops for faster trips.
Don't remove bus routes when max/street car lines are added - more access from hood to hood & not just from a hood to downtown - increase the mass transit options & affordability for east of 82nd.
More competition from innovative transportation options like Uber.
clean energy, reliability, appearance/user experience.
More frequent buses. The more buses, the more people will use them. Cheaper mass transit – how about reducing subsidies for cars and applying them to mass transit?

Better biking and walking within urban areas. Getting across rivers via boat with connection sites to make people's connection with water more intimate, therefore relevant to protect and clean up.

I'm not a bicyclist commuter because it is too dangerous to ride on the street. I strongly favor the creation of bike-friendly streets with limited local access and heavy traffic calming techniques - I'm thinking similar to SE Clinton but even stronger measures. Half and full closures and roundabouts are working there but more are needed.

Express routes are important. Express trains, express buses all help get commuters to their destination in a comparable amount of time to taking their own car. Even a "bus highway" lane or route would help make a change to the amount of traffic on I-5.

Consider making transit free, or at least free to those of low income, and see how it impacts the results on ridership.

Electric buses versus trains/street cars. Strong socio-economic considerations - services to poorer communities.

For Tri-Met to go back to zones as I think it is silly for close in people to pay as much as riders who live 20-30 miles out. To decide that the 'hub' for all light rail not be in downtown Portland and to make it easier for folks who work not in downtown to get there w/o transferring and having to wait for a bus.

It's very important that working people have genuinely convenient and affordable options for using public transportation. Ideally public transportation would be free and paid for out of general tax revenues, so that EVERYONE would see it as an option they've already paid for.

Target investments to neighborhoods with the greatest need for resources and support. Target low income communities and communities with a high percentage of people of color in order to support their ability to get to jobs and schools. They need it the most.

Under served sections of our region.

Safety and affordability.

Safer bike routes. More frequent bus schedules.

More frequent bus and train service is the main way to create more capacity and to make transit easier for people. Crowded, uncomfortable, unclean buses deter many people.

Transit frequency is important to boost ridership. The region should look at providing free youth passes to middle and high school students as a way to boost ridership and create the next generation of transit riders.

Don't lose sight of travel time in people's decision to use (or not use) transit.

Bicycle ridership would be improved if there were safer biking options such as separate bike lanes.
Wealth disparity and the growing number of people who have difficulty with current transit costs. Implementation should also take into account the changing nature of the metro area's population and the fact it is not downtown-centric but rather more movement is north-south outside the central business district.

It needs to be affordable for all, and it needs to be convenient for all. Transit needs to be frequent enough that it's a viable commuter option.

Transit dependent populations - ensuring their access. transit experience - make it fabulous to attract riders.

Personal safety seems to be the biggest concern of folks in my age group (seniors) that I try to talk into trying mass transit.

Weekend & evening schedules should not be curtailed to areas of parking congestion. Because of permitting high density infill condos & apartments without parking many areas of our city are not accessible by car. Mass transit is a good solution but their schedules must coincide with business use such as restaurants & theatres.

Cost and ease of access. Better job of selling Clackamas County, where i will be working in the near future.

Low income communities should be priorities for bus service.

Increasing frequency where ridership has increased. Some routes and times I am always standing. Where has possible ridership increased, such as developments with limited parking? As far as affordable, I think TriMet has to look at its own administrative costs and cut out waste and duplication. Also, businesses that don't provide Bus Passes must be taxed at a rate dependent on the number of employees.

I think this is all great but more importantly I think we need to figure out how to encourage people to step out of their convenient luxury of their own vehicle to take public transit. No matter how cheap/easy/safe etc... it is people are so reliable on their cars :(.

We need more separate bike paths - friendly for families and hesitant bikers, and true recreational alternatives (i.e. separate path that leads from the city to a destination like a park to camp in or other lodging). I think street cars are not a good priority - tracks are a hazard and they are less practical than buses.

Balancing cars, public transit and bicycles.

Making sure all parts of the area have services.

Equity. Invest in areas with lower incomes and less infrastructure FIRST.

Safety and accessibility and cost to users.

Portland and/or Oregon will need to pass a strict liability law for accidents between drivers and bicyclists to change the car centric culture. I lived for a year in Amsterdam and my children biked everywhere safely by themselves because Amsterdam has strict liability--in an accident between a car and a bike, the car is always at fault, driver pays. This means that ACCIDENTS DO NOT HAPPEN. Accidents between bikes and cars are extremely rare, because drivers are very careful and deferential. Everyone helps everyone else move through the city quickly and efficiently. So long as cars can be bullies, people will not use bikes in large numbers. I've even seen city buses behave in bullying. This must stop.
Global warming, pollution from too many vehicles, safety issues due to too many vehicles, the money it takes to maintain roads due to too many vehicles.

Equity. All parts of the Metro area should be included in this build out, and taxes to pay for it should also come from all areas - possibly in the same way urban renewal works.

Frequency of Transit is key to insuring that the public will use it.

Safety.

Future maintenance costs vs. higher capital costs in projects like light rail. They pay off in the end! Much more efficient.

Equity. The people who use transit most (low-income, minority) should be receiving more frequent service - not just commuters.

Need and accessibility.

Preserve "walk ability", pedestrian access.

Establish funding.

Policies that make driving more difficult or painful (a stick) should be evaluated alongside policies that make the alternatives like biking and public transit more palatable (a carrot). An example we've already seen in PDX is the designation of streets as bike thoroughfares, with signage supporting cycling and the addition of medians or other navigational obstacles for cars.

Safety first! I loved how I was able, with effort, to get around with my daughter walking and biking, as she grew from 3-13. Now she's on her own a lot of the time, and I worry that our walking and biking investment is sorely underfunded, and that the money we have for this does not prioritize safety. Please show us that this region puts citizen's lives above the speed of car traffic. We also need more direct, frequent, and affordable transit. Greenways should be very inconvenient for motorists. Parking should cost money, and funds should be used for walking and biking. Cars take up way too much space, pollute too much, and kill and injure our friends too often.

The areas experiencing the most growth (i.e. Division street) should be receiving better transit service, rather than trying to reach everyone regardless of density.

The environmental impacts of every decision. All of this should have reducing emissions as a primary goal, not some secondary dimension of these actions.

Walking routes and bike routes to and from max stations and bus stops. Reduced fares for loyal riders, more you ride the cheaper it gets.

I would take public transportation even more if buses were able to get places more quickly and came more often. I would also leave my car behind and bike more if there were more direct routes that were protected from traffic.
1. Improved safety for areas where injuries or deaths have occurred.  
2. Protected bike lanes to encourage all levels and all ages of riders.  
3. More frequent bus service.  

Making it easy and more affordable for more people to take public transport.  

Safety of vulnerable users (pedestrians and bikers).  

Frequent, low-cost service - this needs to serve the low-income population.  

Transit is a good option for commuters but only when it is more convenient than driving personal cars. Adding a deterrent to personal car commuting will help to encourage higher use of mass transit options. Examples of deterrents used in other cities are a bridge toll for entering Oregon across I5 or I205 during morning rush hour, a toll for entering the downtown area on weekdays with a personal vehicle, and increasing working hour parking rates with municipal taxes.  

For too many decades, the personal automobile has been made the priority. Many people would like to walk, bicycle or take public transit but there needs to be more priority given to those modes of transportation.  

Investing in under-served areas.  

cost of implementation. Increasing Bus frequency is most cost-effective than building new rail. Hard to serve locations (lower density suburbs) must receive certain matching investments from the local tax base to service more expensive to reach locations, and density should increase to ensure transit usage.  

Population density in areas should help determine what infrastructure is required. A lack of parking for all of the new construction apartment buildings should force more infrastructure to support walking and biking. Connecting densely populated areas separated by rural or less-developed spaces to allow for people to get between the densely populated areas easier.  

Expanded mass transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure.  

More frequent public transit access. Better facilities for bikes in central areas (weather-protected secure parking). Any building that requires parking as part of it's development, should be required to include good bike parking and facilities.  

I think we need to consider the elderly and families with small children in making safe routes for biking and walking. Making sure that there are safe ways to travel between public transportation options both with bikes and walking.  

I think frequent and affordable transit is very pressing in our region. I think a focus on getting from point A to point B fast should be a priority - I favor transit having its own right of way. I also would like to see better transit options between metro areas - particularly PDX and Salem.  

Frequency, increase service to more neighborhoods, affordability for poor.  

Enhance transit options in areas currently underserved by convenient service. For example, TriMet does a great job of getting plenty of buses on routes where there are already a lot of riders. Emphasis should be placed on creating more riders in areas not traditionally known for transit ridership.
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Keeping public transit ticket prices affordable.
Equitable distribution of services.
Frequency + Connectivity + Reliability = Real mobility by transit.
We need better transit access outside of the central city.
Equity; apply Multnomah County’s equity & empowerment lens.
Income and demographic information. Pedestrian safety.
The easier it is to access the transit system the more people will use it. If you can only get a bus or train every 30 minutes it is often easier to drive.
Most efficient methods of transporting people where they need to go such as expanding light rail/bus frequency and reach.
It is critical that we find ways to encourage people to stop making more people.
Riders with limited income.
I would love to take public transit, but I live in St. Johns and work in Pearl. It takes 15 minutes to drive, but 45 minutes for the bus (or just to bike, but the bike routes are scary...). Convenience is my issue.
Bike lanes are insufficient. Portland drivers pay too little attention to their driving and frequently ignore lane markings. Many drivers are ill informed about pedestrian right of way. Many drivers don't seem to be aware of the benefits to them of other people not driving. Better driver training needs to be available and mandatory.
Availability of transit to low income or non-traditional workers. The current system focuses heavily on moving people into downtown for an 8-5 workday.
Develop a plan to use smaller buses when the larger ones are no longer needed on a particular route. TriMet needs to put reader boards on its red line. Also, the red line needs to run 24 hours, to serve the airlines AND all the people who work in the airport area. There needs to be CLEAR instructions for how to purchase tickets, for the benefit of visitors to Portland.
More transit to North Portland - St-Johns is hard to get to!
Making transit equitable for people living in all parts of the metro area. Also, making transit more affordable. For example, it should be cheaper to buy a month bus pass than a daily pass.
Would be nice to have better TriMet bus service from NW Portland to St Johns. Manage labor costs at TriMet so they don't have the best benefits in the entire nation. Need to contain those costs a bit more. Streetcar is wonderful!
Ensuring affordable costs for everyone; regular and timely service.
Ways to make the most of the budget and help the least affluent Oregonians with good transportation options.
Providing door-to-door transportation options for persons with disabilities and older persons. Plan to reduce potential conflicts between autos, bicyclists and pedestrians by modifying roadways (curbs separating cycle and pedestrian paths).

Keep senior cost at $1 per trip with ticket good for 4 hours. Frequency needs to be at least every 30 minutes until midnight. No reduction in existing routes. We bought our house because it is on a route.

Stop treating downtown Portland as the center of everything.

Reducing the amount of travel.

With limited means, the strategies that dramatically increase ridership should be emphasized: frequency and performance/reliability are far more important at the metropolitan scale than providing subsidized fares.

Existing transit options, frequency, overall walkability (especially in guiding development that prioritizes walkability and providing good, convenient options).

Put more emphasis on hybrid modes of transportation: expand existing "park and ride" and add more of these; modify buses and light rail to increase use by bicyclists. Bet on these things that are clearly winners before gambling on other things that are not yet proven.

The limited space on roads means that increased bus traffic makes pedestrian and bicycle traffic more dangerous. Buses are not the best choice when evaluating increased transit options.

The region needs to do its part to raise the local money to fund the expansion, coverage, and operation of the system. Also, the state needs to contribute and barriers, such as the way the gas tax can be spent, need to be removed to provide more funding mechanisms to support this investment.

Safety at transit stops and on the transit systems. I use public transportation often and the number one thing that makes me second guess using it is the amount of shady folks and homeless around the transit pick up spots.

Focus on non-car alternative transportation.

The system needs to be cost-effective and intentional instead of driven by how many federal dollars can be grabbed. The area's mass transit provider is among the most poorly managed and least cost/benefit-conscious agency in the area.

Making sure that as jobs locations change the transit can change with it.

Take everybody's interests into account. Don't over-emphasize the car, or the bike, or the walking legs of pedestrians. The current work on Barbur Blvd is a huge pain to navigate around, especially as so many other projects on roads coming off it or on those nearby are being done. Equally as important, try not to cut down so many mature trees every time you make transit "improvements" or changes!!! For a city that prides itself on being green, it is astounding how many mature trees get the literal ax. I'd veto most transit improvements/changes for the sole reason that the city/state/municipality/Metro cuts down trees as though they were blades of grass. I doubt I'm alone in thinking that.
Try not to cut down any trees as you do this and then I will be 100% supportive. Everywhere I look around Portland, trees are being cut down by the city/Metro in order to widen roads, install sidewalks, do whatever. And these are the older, larger trees that will take decades to replace. Please stop it.

Working with businesses, especially with low wage jobs, to provide a transit pass or a reduce cost transit pass for their employees.

Frequency is important, and if increasing frequency means fewer riders on any one bus... maybe it's time for smaller buses.

Making sure there is transit service where people need to go. Don't cut back on service or frequency. Keep transit clean and safe.

Expand Max to Lake Oswego, Tigard, etc. Bus service late at night is spotty - more buses - more frequently.

A community's willingness to build sufficient density to support frequent transit.

While I certainly appreciate the focus on eastern pdx in increasing transit frequency, the SW is still very underserved--both with respect to transit (my local bus comes 1x/hr!) and bike infra.

Make sure that the transit options are targeted to currently underserved areas and populations. A major effort in the urbanizing areas where previous policies do not require the development of safe walking and biking routes. connect to existing trail/bike-way systems.

Planning Depts in the region cannot continue to perpetrate zoning that is single use and separates uses by large distances. Example: big box development along HWY 217.

Geography, demographics.

Safety and comfort of bus stops (lighting, seating). Transit route hours (convenience for people working later at nights). Investment in sidewalks and street lighting. Safety of crosswalks. Ease of access for people with disabilities.

Make certain that land use policies support transportation investments (e.g., authorize and facilitate high-density, mixed use development along transit lines).

Investing in streetcars should be a high priority. They are clean and can carry more people than busses in a single trip.

Increase frequency of buses and trains; expand light rail system; expand WES/commuter rail system.

Making transit more frequent and expansive should be the top priority. The more useless the bus system gets, the fewer the people who will use it. What good is a transit system that takes 10 times longer to get anywhere than driving? Trimet is no longer an attractive option - only a last resort.

I think we need to look at the current system and make some changes. Trimet is not run efficiently, staff are overpayed, benefits are platinum plated. There are too many stops along routes (decrease frequency). Before we make the monster bigger some major changes need to occur with how trimet is operated before the trust of the community is earned.
How to make it free for all. Also would like to see frequent smaller shuttle buses to transport people to MAX stations from neighborhoods that are further removed from them.

Less rail/streetcar, more bus. Use articulated buses on busy routes. Express routes from downtown to 39th or 50th (e.g. no stops west end of bridge to 39th).

I know that the city is very into making biking accessible, but the bus still takes a lot more people to work than bikes do. There are going to need to be quite a few more express bus routes from some of the more outlying areas that stop in SE and NE since no one who works in SE or NE can afford to live there anymore. It is really difficult to justify taking a two hour bus ride to get to work.

If it actually serves the target population and not just some modeled population. Often projects are oriented to the ideal population and not to the underserved and actual population.

I know that the city is very into making biking accessible, but the bus still takes a lot more people to work than bikes do. There are going to need to be quite a few more express bus routes from some of the more outlying areas that stop in SE and NE since no one who works in SE or NE can afford to live there anymore. It is really difficult to justify taking a two hour bus ride to get to work.

If it actually serves the target population and not just some modeled population. Often projects are oriented to the ideal population and not to the underserved and actual population.

Current and future needs of our people. You should add the word 'safe' to the question.

Lightrail to outlying areas.

Further loss of gas tax income to fund transportation improvement. Where will the funding for these projects come from? Reducing fares will also cause a temporary dip in resources unless ridership can be greatly increased.

Work to increase the gas tax so that we can expand transit options at a rate commensurate with statewide population growth and keep transit affordable.

Net cost per mile of maintenance.

1. Lumping bicycle transportation with walking is very uninformed and it's unfair to the question asked. 2. SAFE WALKING should be the BIGGEST priority over all else. Not everyone rides a bike or drives a car but almost everyone walks. 3. Portland police do not adequately enforce pedestrian crossing laws, making a simple walk to the store a dangerous enterprise.

Max trains are scary at times, I avoid the max when I can especially at night. It feels lawless and filled with criminals.

We need to look long term and build systems that will be a part of the infrastructure fabric of our city for generations. People need to be able to count on transit. Schedules and availability have a huge impact (not always seen in ridership) on the community that they serve.

Where is the money going to come from? Are my taxes going to go up? Will small business taxes go up?


Keep cost of transit low - it may seem sensible to raise fares as costs increase, however this will discourage people from taking transit vs driving and increase costs in road maintenance.
Low income families and the populations who have been pushed to the edges of Portland by gentrification should be considered and priority should be given to investments that would increase their access to transit options. I also think consideration should be given to bring Portland back to the top of the crop and reinvigorate the progressive bike-able city we once were... i.e., more buffered bike lanes and other radical bike infrastructure that other cities have surpassed us on.

Keeping transit centers safe -- many people avoid them due to fear of crime.

Ensuring that high capacity transit lines are aligned with affordable housing.

Regional equity: which areas have historically had lower public investment but deserve more?

Safe routes for peds and bicyclists by reducing conflicts with auto traffic.

Population centers, income, and need.

Cost efficiency, equity, creation of alternative transit programs to support groups with special needs such as medical visitations, access to food, education and jobs; economic development potential.

On multi lane streets, consider repurposing a pair of general travel lanes as bus-only lanes. This will do double duty of increasing reliability and speed of bus service and make it competitive with driving during the peak.

1. Frequency of buses and trains. Trimet provides at best 15 minute service. A one hour shopping trip can require up to 29 minutes of waiting time in addition to bus riding time. Too many route have 20 minutes. 2. Bus routes with low ridership should have smaller buses operating on frequent schedules. 3. Trimet's goal should be a bus every five minutes. 4. The distance to a bus stop should be no more than a five minute walk.

Equity for east Portland and other areas outside the city core-- everyone needs frequent runs to make commuting by transit appealing! Also, expanding bikes on transit so no one has to guess if there will be room on the next bus or MAX. Safe and pleasant walking and cycling trumps speed.

How to be equitable. It starts looking like social engineering when light rail is an investment in some areas and its less attractive and lower investment sibling Rapid Transit Bus is thrust upon other neighborhoods.

Stop ridiculous costly light rail and streetcar and buy Eco-friendly BUSES that can go anywhere and help EVERYONE (instead of suburban travelers/commuters).

More frequent and convenient transit should be developed.

In my opinion, reducing private vehicle use is essential to reducing carbon emissions and moving away from a car culture. I think Portland - Vancouver should consider how they might make mass transit free. The benefits of reduced vehicle traffic and pollution could be quantified (if they must) by calculating the reduced medical costs derived from less pollution.

Max lines all the way to Oregon City and Vancouver.
Easing access to downtown and other important employment centers for moderate to low-income citizens - particularly those in the underserved East Side.

Reducing private automobile use.

Convience.

Areas of greatest need.

Equitable access and affordability. User-friendly and efficient

I think it's very important to make the buses more reliable and service more frequent. The unreliable service makes the bus very difficult to depend on as a primary mode of transportation.

Carpool lanes would encourage fewer cars and make reduce traffic jams. Kids should be free on all public transit so they have better access to public transit and reduce the financial burden on parents.

Better safety, easier for seniors to use.

More light rail lines & connections for the future.

Cost-effectiveness Re-purposing what is currently motor vehicle lanes to use as bus lanes or rail ROW. Our region is far too timid in doing this, which is the cheapest and most effective way to raise transit's share of travel in the area.

Metro should focus on continuing to increase services within the existing growth boundary rather than expanding the boundary. Trimet should be looking very objectively at what transit mode would have the most impact for its cost. It should also provide multimodal connections to outdoor recreational opportunities.

Bike share should be considered as public transit. Biking and walking access to reliable, frequent transit should be prioritized over park-n-rides and other auto-centric facilities.

Wide access; frequency; interface between multiple modes of transportation (biking and buses, cars and trains, etc.).

Focus on tying transit in with other transportation methods to maximize it's appeal to diverse groups. Park and ride infrastructure, secure bicycle parking, bike transportation on busses etc.

Increasing bus performance efficiency for better on-time performance (the top factor for choice riders); a regional YouthPass program to create the next generation of transit riders; a low-income fare program to ensure equitable access to opportunity and increased community resiliency; a more accurate model for ridership growth and VMT reduction than is currently employed in air quality conformity assessment.

The most "green way" possible.

Access by low income communities who may rely more heavily on the transit system. Keeping bike lanes separate from Max and Street Car tracks. It is unsafe for the cyclists!

Direct walking and bike routes, building new connections/more routes, keeping it affordable for low income.

Equitable access to transit, followed by cost-effectiveness.
I would like to see free public transit in the Portland Metro area. Ridership would skyrocket. Safety would increase, as drivers need only concentrate on driving and helping with customer needs.

This could be an effective way to reduce congestion since it currently has the metro area's highest mode share other than single occupancy vehicle. In order for this to work effectively, I believe that infrastructure changes must be implemented, including removal of traffic lanes and parking in places in favor of bus rapid transit or commuter rail.

Find the areas that are designed for transit and focus on them first. Places that are auto centric should be a low priority for bus service until such time as the cities decide to work on making them more friendly to transit use.

Providing frequent and well connected service to reduce travel times to incentivize transit ridership. The most common reason I hear for people not taking transit is that it takes over an hour to get where they want to go (I work in Beaverton and live downtown).

Best ways to encourage people to move out of their cars. Safety is one consideration.

Use an external cost analysis to compute the real costs of various transportation modes, to verify that mass transit really is more economic than private transit, when environmental and social costs are included.

Consider walking only streets, and protected corridors for walkers, and bikers, separate from cars.

Continue to expand streetcar, bike, pedestrian access to the city. I am primarily a walker, and there are many areas of the city in which sidewalks are non-existent or in severe disrepair.

Equity for underserved/disadvantaged neighborhoods, considering percentage of car owning households in an neighborhood. More frequent service for the most crowded routes.

Helping the working poor easily get to work, childcare, etc. I would gladly pay more so someone working 2 jobs with kids could pay less.

Put where transit is most needed. Keep tracks, equipment safe and repaired.

Safety and convenience.

Equity.

Quality of experience is also important.
While I love the concept of street car and light rail conceptually, they are a horrible choice for investment and don't work well for the following reasons: 1, they are not policed well enough that they do not feel safe as a rider - my wife grew up riding the Max and Portland buses and she absolutely refuses to use them anymore because of safety concerns (and I know she's not alone); and 2, because the streetcar is not below ground and thus is subject to traffic lights and fighting auto traffic, unless the trip is more than about 1.5 miles I can almost always walk to my destination faster than waiting for and riding the streetcar if I have to wait to board the streetcar for more than 2 minutes. However, I find buses very confusing - and unnecessarily so. Why can't more be done to make identifying the route that buses travel more intuitive? Why can't an electronic sign be mounted on the side of a bus that clearly and easily shows the stops the bus goes to, and where that bus is in real time? Why can't there be an electronic sign mounted on the front of the bus that lists the next two stops as well as the end of the line - so that when a bus is approaching people can more easily figure out whether it's the bus they should be taking?

Promote public transit more.

All options should be on the table - light rail, bus, rapid bus, street car, and even river transit.

Adequate transit to employment areas.

HOT lanes, privatizing the bus system, jitneys.

I think public transportation should be close to free for everyone, publicly subsidized. At the very least it should be free for students and anyone receiving any kind of public assistance.

Transit service should be improved where the right policies and existing conditions can best support ridership.

More train and street car lines more frequent and later night service on bus 46.

Cost to taxpayers, cost to transit users.

Increasing access & usage throughout greater Portland-- all quadrants.

Giving priority to multi modes of transportation; we still give single occupancy vehicles priority.

How to engage those in the suburbs to use transit instead of driving. Also, how to increase biking within the suburbs for short trips, to cut down on trips made for less than 2 miles.

How to make transit more, or at least as, convenient as driving and parking.

Providing a variety of modes of transportation. Increasing public transit frequency. Safety.

The policy must go beyond transportation itself and include land use, residential and commercial development as well. The process should end with transportation rather than begin with it otherwise we will see the same old result, more of this and less of that without a program set in an environment.

Convenience (how far is the stop from where I'm going? How easy is it to get to the stop?), reliability (can I rely on the bus to show up on time?).

Comprehensive plan that covers the entire Metro area to reduce miles driven in cars with only 1 person in them.
Right now Portland has many young and active residents able to ride bikes, but as the population ages, reliance on public transportation will increase. It is important for that demographic to feel safe and have easy access to frequent public transportation.

Keeping costs down so the transit is affordable; serving suburban areas at all hours and days.

Studying traffic patterns, aiming to reduce congestion/pollution by making public transit an attractive alternative to driving.

Ensure transit doesn't impede bicycling. Too often buses and bikes are trying to share same space.

Better information systems.

How to get the money from "defense spending" rather than from my pocketbook.

Equity, youth needs, safe biking and walking to transit.

Ease of use for riders. make transit tracker less prone to giving info for the wrong stop, giving arrival times which are inaccurate, and forcing callers to listen to unwanted information. more covered stops with seating for people with disabilities.

As long as the priorities are correct - focus on street repairs, more buses, less streetcar or bike lanes.

Connectivity is not easy or efficient for east west journeys. Streetcar should be expanded.

Howeve don't just build more & more without maintaining what there already is. Also weigh cheaper options first such as walking & biking routes over light rail routes.

Frequent service better customer service get rid of bad drivers and rude employees in general.

Working with land-use planners so that growth is connected with transit corridors. Expand use of pre-tax transit passes through employers. Do a better job of calculating and publicizing monies saved versus existing subsidies to traditional car-based transportation.

Transportation infrastructure investments (light rail, dedicated bus lanes) that spur local investment in development. Infrastructure insures that making investments in higher density will pay off; simply extending a bus line to an area does not because bus lines can always be changed. More permanent infrastructure helps investment.

Better light rail connections, better bike routes, make driving more expensive.

Getting the most bang for the buck. Many of these are hooked into reducing healthcare costs in the short and long run, so I say start there.

People tend to consider public transportation for the poor. It should be something good and useful for everyone -- supporting a cleaner city, a more friendly and community oriented city.

Shorter wait times for the bus, high speed light rail along the entire west coast with connections in cities and towns, parking tax to fund the transit system and make it free.

Ease and affordability.

Access to Hayden Island & cost/benefit of light rail/street car vs dedicated bus routes / expanded bus service.
Cost, communication with the people impacted (especially where the transit runs through neighborhoods).

Frequency and connectivity for transit, limiting private auto access.

Not raising prices. Trimet is more expensive than parking in many places.

Improving transit service to communities that will use it and need affordable transportation options.

Prioritize bus rapid-transit (as in Seattle), more frequent bus service, extending bus lines, extending light rail, and making MAX service much faster, especially through downtown. The last item will require biting the bullet and putting MAX into a tunnel under downtown Portland, to dramatically speed up travel times...that way it will actually be an attractive alternative to cars. I strongly believe we also need *express* buses, as in Seattle's Metro Transit. I strongly argue for *dramatically* increasing funding for transit, allowing needed system expansion.


The only way to get people to use mass transit over their cars is to make it cheaper, fast and more convenient.

Willingness of business community to support trimet and subsidize employee passes.

People should be encouraged to ride buses and MAX and making them more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable. would help. Having more 'express' buses would lead to more commuters riding. It's probably way too complicated but I wish transit rides could be less costly for low-income folks.

Cost of course. Buses are much cheaper than rails. Speed. How can transit be faster?

Automobile traffic should be de-prioritized so that people want to talk/bike/take public transportation because it's faster and more cost effective.

Provide deeper discounts on bulk transit ticket purchases. Incentivize people to purchase monthly passes, or books of tickets that can be used in the future... you'll sell more tickets than seats, and people will be encouraged to consider and pre-plan their trip to include public transit, since they have tickets that need to be used.

Population density and employment density. Moving people from where they live to where they work.

In addition to typical locational analysis (jobs, housing, community attractors), look carefully at public high schools, especially in Portland, and try and coordinate with / influence (via regional policies) school districts as they make boundary decisions. Many PPS high school students ride TriMet, bike, or would like to walk to school (or need to due to lack of car in their family, etc), but PPS rarely if ever looks at student travel when it changes school attendance boundaries, resulting in some students having to travel far to attend a "neighborhood" high school when there is actually a closer high school.

Access and safety for all communities.

Frequency of transit routes to make them reliable for everyday trips. Ideally, transit will arrive every 10 minutes or less.
We need policies that will do more than just build infrastructure for good bicycling and active transportation modes. We need to help people make lifestyle changes with encouragement programming with measurable outcome which focuses on reaching non-traditional bike riders including women, middle and high school students.

We should effectively incentivize modes that produce public benefit, and de-incentivize ones that come with substantial environmental and health costs.

Transit should have priority lanes over single passenger vehicles or freight.

Frequency of the transit network should be improved and access to public transit stops via active modes are very important.

Making it easier to commute rather than to drive.

The impact on neighborhoods.

Frequent service is the key. Consider Vancouver Canada - the #99 is an articulated express bus that runs so often there is no schedule needed. And reduce the fares if you can - $5 roundtrip is expensive. Use loadable cards that can be tapped on the driver's meter (like in Washington DC) or inserted into a card reader. Paper tickets are old-fashioned.

Prioritize convenience & frequency in transit options. An infrequent busline is almost worse than no busline at all.

Flexibility and currently under-served areas. For example, how many buses could we have bought with the money spent on the tram? We seem to throw billions of dollars at the people who least need it. Meanwhile streets in east Portland are not paved.

Making investments where they'll be productively used rather than spreading them everywhere to satisfy politics.

For each additional investment in transit, how much additional ridership might be gained, how much might intensification of surrounding land uses be supported, and how much GHG might be reduced?

Make transit more readily accessible to those who live east of the I-205 corridor (not just along Burnside), and those in outer Clackamas county.

Tram & dedicated bus routes, along with bike lanes.

Fairness in coverage to all areas.

Areas of coverage and overall transit time from one area to another.

Frequency, Visibility, consider a region wide $1 a day pass that everyone would pay as part of taxes, with exemptions available.

Neighborhoods that rely more on local transit, usually lower income, are often the furthest away from transit. Time frames for travelers... for example, living in NE, I find I often have to go downtown to get a bus somewhere else.... perhaps more choices?
Transit is currently WAY too expensive. folks who own cars state they can't afford/are unwilling to pay for transit to go to special events, etc., even if they would prefer not to drive. those who do not have their own vehicles generally fall into lower income brackets - the cost of transit has far outpaced these incomes!

Don't know.

Issues of equity.

Equity, low income populations, progressive strategies to make sure that increased transportation costs do not unfairly burden low income people.

Transit already costs too much in our region. If we're going to improve the transit system, it should be done via taxes on local corporations and the wealthiest citizens, not the riders who already can't afford it in fare or taxes.

Environmental sustainability.

Lower income families, affordability.

Where does the majority of the population live that uses transit, that's where it needs to be beefed up! Those that don't travel very far, within one zone, pay too much.

Reducing fares on public transportation, and reinstating fareless zones (in zones where they are actually needed - not in the Pearl).

Better options for taking bikes on Max. Better bike parking at Max stations. Bike share as a last mile solution.

Cost, sure, but more important is our impact on our future.

Accessibility to major areas of the city by any means (biking, public transit, etc.).

Safety should be a priority. Riding the MAX, without a driver or security person onboard, is scary, particularly for elderly or vulnerable people. These are the people who need safe transit the most.

Prioritize urban planning options that improve transit opportunities and health by increasing pedestrian and bike paths and placing housing and retail in close proximity.

Express service from outlying areas to city centers, commuter service between city centers.

Pricing carbon or gasoline to help fund more transit and transition to cleaner fuels.

Make minimum walking time to a transit stop uniform through the service region.

Increase frequencies More express routes (rail+bus+brt) All night/late night service Bike sharing system similar to OVFiets in The Netherlands should be part of regional transit system.

Make it possible to take bikes of all sizes on Max.

The political will to tax residents so that Tri-Met can lower prices and increase frequency so as to actually encourage its use.

Livability, cost, frequency.
Truly equitable distribution of more convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable transit. Safe walkways to public transit (doesn't always have to be pavement - but something to keep people from walking in the street). Public transit that uses little energy resources and doesn't pollute. And QUIET. Squeaking brakes and bus engines are awful!

Expand transit, safe biking and walking routes, cheaper public transit.

Maintain and enhance existing infrastructure and assets (bus lines, MAX) before building more new projects (street cars).

Find a way to actually make transit faster than driving private cars.

Understanding where the greatest need for transportation exists and work to improve the quality, frequency and accessibility to transit.

Let's set some goals, create a vision of X percent of people in the region having access to transit within x distance of their home, x % of the time. Give us something to hope & strive for.

Making physical activity easy and safe for everyone.

1) maintenance of existing infrastructure & enhancements to areas that have been lacking (unimproved roads etc), 2) development consistent with local neighborhoods, 3) separation of bike/peds from cars (the current mixing is increasingly unsafe for all.

Increased service frequency and density should be focused on low-income communities and communities of color who have been displaced by gentrification. Reducing fares for everyone, but especially low-income individuals, should be a major priority.

The minimization of under-served areas should be of the highest priority. Those who have had chronic disinvestment should be advanced for more investment first.

Providing the best connectivity for the given $. Shaking the money tree to get more money for operations might be better than simply building more capital intensive projects.

Prioritize service to neighborhoods with the best opportunities for residents to avoid or minimize automobile ownership. Add service frequency in proportion to the payoff in % and number of non auto trips.

Put most effort on regular bus systems; they are the most flexible. Buses can go around disruptions, unlike light rail and trains. Routes can also be changed when appropriate. Get out of the development business and get back to transit.

Holistic view of the entire system, reduce redundancies and expand service.

Reduced fares.

More Public Transit.

Need to have ways to get people to areas other than downtown in a convenient manner.

Let's make sure we serve poorer communities with reliable transportation, too.
As a "senior approaching valued citizen age", pedestrian safety has to be a top priority. Simply put, you cannot use public transit if you can't walk safely to and from it, and too often in Portland, bus stops are not placed strategically close to visible crosswalks (ie., places where cars will actually pay attention to someone trying to cross the street).

Reducing fares would be the least of my concerns. If buses/Max come often and reliably, and if there is parking available at hubs, more people will ride.

The long term opportunity cost of transit investment mitigates the short term capital expense (not sure if I've invoked these terms correctly... I just mean to say that not building transit, in the long run, is more expensive than building it).

Find a way to get drivers out of their cars and onto public transit, bicycles and/or walking. Especially single occupants in huge gas guzzling, emission belching vehicles.

People need buses and trains to run, regularly and frequently, all day long, every day - not just at "peak" times five days a week. + If fares were collected from all MAX/streetcar passengers, there would be more cash to use - this city has got to get real about folks paying to ride (maybe that would even get the fares down).

Reinstating former bus routes like the 33 (which used to run along NE Fremont) and have them run daily and on the weekends for longer hours. Currently, for example, the 24 only runs limited hours and only weekdays.

Return fareless square concept in high congestion areas like downtown PDX.

Be pragmatic. It is tough to change human behavior. Much of what is being done is ideologically desirable but doesn't make much sense from a cost/utilization perspective. An example is the street cars on Wiedler and the inner east side. They aren't very occupied, they cost a ton and had overrides and delays and...practically speaking they CAUSE traffic slowdown. They are ideologically cool but are a bad idea. The money could have been spent better in other ways.

This is a tough problem when we live in a spread out community. I often think we are in the habit of driving because transit is not frequent enough. So if buses were more frequent, there would be a lag time during which they would be almost empty, till people caught on... and then they would be packed!

Access by low-income and working residents and the need to get to jobs and address basic needs.

I wish safety was also mentioned in this initiative. As a female, I am too frightened to wait for most transit spots by myself, especially the Eastside Max Trains. I also miss fareless square, but do not miss riding with the homeless people. I'd love to ride the Max more often with my kids to get around, but the other people on the train make us uncomfortable with their inappropriate conversations. Still too many unsavory characters associated with the Max for me.

Providing adequate service to people in hard to reach neighborhoods of the city, and ensure that transit services are frequent enough to meet people's needs.
Bus frequency and transit equity.  
Housing! We need more housing in close proximity to transit infrastructure whether it's a max station or a bike path. Transit investments won't payoff without increasing density.  
Investment should be focused in the places where communities are growing or lacking in sufficient service now.  
Use the most cost effective and least polluting option. Focus on neighborhoods that have the fewest transit choices. Determine where people need to go. Find ways to get regular feedback from riders, a la Uber.  
Reliable, frequent service.  
Less emphasis on trolley, more bus service to farther out areas. Consider smaller buses for lines which have little ridership.  
Decrease funding to MAX and Street Car as they are very expensive to build and extremely inflexible (can't change routes, can't go around construction/collisions, can't provide express lines). Buses are much cheaper, more flexible and primarily use existing infrastructure.  
Population More direct routes between work/home Skip downtown hub.  
A bus that runs down NE Fremont directly downtown, for me! :) Trimet reduced the convenience of this and many other routes, requiring more transfers, That's inconvenient.  
Relieving congestion, by a multitude of means, on several of the major Portland arteries: I-5 corridor; I-84 corridor; I-405; I-205; Hwy 26; MLK/99E; Williams/Vancouver; Burnside; NE 33rd Consider how low income people, who work within a 5-6 mile radius of downtown, will be able to commute at a reasonable cost in a quick manner. Make public transit more appealing than driving yourself. That can mean a lot of things, e.g., easy access, reasonable fares, as quick as a car. Create more bike only routes. This would be safer, less irritating to both bikers and drivers.  
People will have to use cars less in Portland. There are too many people for everyone to have a car. The infrastructure cannot handle it plus the pollution will make the quality of life bad. I personally get around in a power wheelchair and would like to see better sidewalks and curb ramps. The side walks here are in terrible condition. Sometimes I have to ride in the street which is dangerous for an old woman in a wheelchair. I am glad people are bicycling more but I think money should be spent on making walking and getting around in a wheelchair safer.  
Location of new multi family projects (apartments). We have a new building at NE 46th & Fremont, with very limited parking, and no Fremont bus service on weekends.  
Connectivity and safe bike routes. Pedestrian access to parks and grocery stores.  
Consider *free* public transit, and the political movement necessary to get it funded, so that movement within the region is not an obstacle to accomplishing basic life tasks, so that people are more free to pursue their livelihoods, attend to their health, and enjoy their communities.
Flexible micro transit service within residential areas; improved transfer coordination, especially between Max & bus system.

Of course, cost must be balanced off against utility. More should be spent serving poorer communities, where driving is not typically an option. I hate to see the 10 come by with 4 passengers when a mile and a half away the 4 or the 6 are packed.

Yes, but, improved transit does not mean eliminating access for cars. More and more streets are being put on a "diet" which translates to eliminating lanes and adding more bike lanes. This should not be done unless there is clear understanding of impact to traffic. Traffic has become more congested and more difficult to navigate because of these policies. Cyclists are a very small minority of commuters. I support anyone who wants to travel by other means than a car (I am an avid walker) however, recent changes to the inner Portland core have only created more problems, heavier traffic, more dangerous conditions.

Too much emphasis on fixed rail (MAX and especially trolleys). Regular bus transit needs to be expanded - it is flexible, can be adjusted due to changed needs, and can go around obstructions. Rail is intended to favor developers, not riders. Forget about spending for bikeways to rail - I never had trouble figuring out how to ride down available existing street when I biked to work years ago.

Improve access to certain neighborhoods, consider "express" trains/buses that skip some stops to get from point A to B quicker (e.g. a MAX train that skips over most of the downtown stops).

It's important to pursue a transit strategy that maximizes safety, health, and equity while being cost effective. To me and the folks I hear from on a daily basis, that means investing in active transportation, from safe bike routes to work and school, to affordable mass transit options, and safe walkable streets.

More bike options and better bus options.

The input you receive from citizens about places where there needs to be more frequent public transit services, safer bike and walking routes, etc.

Consideration of low income neighborhoods - transit and active transportation development spread equitably across the region; tie with safe neighborhoods.

Opportunity cost of building parking lots instead of productive living, working, and playing space. Cost savings of less frequent street repairs with decreased traffic. Productivity gains of reducing traffic congestion. Reduced health care costs of cleaner air.

Greatest good for the greatest number. Safety to the users and the public. Affordability get the most for our buck.

Transit expenses remain a burden for those with low or no income. This is particularly true for college students, who are generally spending on school whatever income they generate. Youth fares should be changed to student fares, and extended to include college students and those attending trade schools.

Activity (bicycling, walking, etc.) friendly transit options and planned fund for maintenance.
expanding the bike safety lanes and educating non-bikers as to their importance, use and necessity.

The prime motivator should be rigorous prioritization of mobility in this order: 1. the disabled, 2. walkers, 3. cyclists, 4. public transport users, and way down the list...car users.

Portland is screwed for the future. All these narrow roads and people moving here like its ShangraLa.

New buses should be quieter -- current ones have noisy motors and exhaust. ok inside, but harsh when they pass you, especially while walking and on a bike. Keep prices reasonable. Buses are very good at on-time arrivals. Keep it up.

Proximity of schools, food (groceries) and services such as libraries to reliable mass transit.

Ability to be within walking distance to transit lines.... today i ride my car to the max despite living within an easy walking distance to the tracks.

Please include safe biking and walking options for east county too. In addition, it would be great if PPS looks at safe routes when looking at district boundary changes.

Safety and accessibility with a shift away from catering to automobiles.

Implement TOD on major transit corridors.

When you reduce frequency and how late transit runs people with choices choose something else (like a car).

1. Provide more frequent service over longer span of time including weekends. 2. Rationalize the route network (grid system). 3. Increase the number of frequent service route connections. 4. Provide signal prioritization for faster service where needed. 5. Use bigger (articulated) buses on heavily used routes. 6. Reestablish some 24 hour (owl) service including service to the airport. 7. Extend the MAX system to the Southwest from South Waterfront to Tualatin and serve OHSU/VA, Hillsdale, Barbur TC and PCC Sylvania with deep tunnel stations 8. Extend MAX to Hayden Island regardless of future decisions on the CRC. 9. Consider an east side light rail connection between the Rose Quarter and OMSI. This connection would allow for the operation of fast north-south rapid transit service between Vancouver WA and Tualatin via the Tillicum Bridge and the SW Corridor. It will be needed in the future as a viable alternative to widening I-5 through the Metro Area. 10. Initiate a strategic plan for an E-W light rail tunnel between the Lloyd District and Goose Hollow to safeguard the future route and portal locations from development. The Steel Bridge will soon be incapable of handling the demand and a much faster east-west regional transit connection will be needed in order to relieve

Where possible there should be more bus "pullouts" so that traffic can flow better. Since it is the law that vehicles need to yield to buses that signal to "reenter" traffic this should not be an traffic issue, rather an infrastructure issue. Where "pull outs" are not available bus drivers need better training as to WHEN to signal, and several need to do a better job of pulling even with curbs so as not to unnecessarily impede traffic because of a lack of driving ability or because of laziness. Since we have many technological capabilities these days some sort of signal sent to bus and other transit stops that shows significant delays would be helpful.
Use transit infrastructure to encourage surrounding urban development that is pedestrian and bicycle friendly.

The most cost-effective strategies in terms of costs and benefits, while ignoring expensive politically-driven projects to the extent possible.

Go all in on this policy. Strongly promote housing and job development (and childcare and shopping) along transit corridors.

Creating, expanding and improving paved paths with no motorized vehicles (like Springwater and 205) should be the top priority.

Offer free service as in some European communities. Make Trimet free.

Making and keeping mass transit affordable.

Actual live/work patterns, focus on accessibility for those with lower incomes.

Making transit affordable to low income families

Taking cars off the road/ I -205 and I-84 ARE PARKING LOTS in the afternoon.

Simple safe foot traffic routes to mass transit and bike corridors.

Neighborhood needs, density and neighborhood support.

Bus frequency makes a huge difference. If a car trip takes 15 minutes and a bus trip takes 45 to 60 minutes because of waiting for buses to arrive and transfers, then it is really hard to convince myself to take the bus. Also, anything that can be done to reduce bus smells / increase ventilation would be great. As a non-smoker, it stinks, literally, to be sitting in a bus reeking of cigarette smoke (or worse) and sometimes I get off the bus needing to wash my clothes.

And "connected" should be included.

In addition to expanding high-capacity transit along major corridors, explore less costly improvements across the entire system, such as signal priority for buses and strategic investment in bus lanes to bypass choke-points and speed service.

Current and trending use patterns, not just historical data. Build for the future, not the past.

Cost to Communities.

A clear numerical tradeoff, Jarrett Walker style, between the share of resources devoted to coverage and those devoted to frequency. Local political control for TriMet, since it serves only people in the metro area. Return on investment for transit vs. biking infrastructure.

Make sure vulnerable populations get served first; make sure transit is linked to other active modes.

Comprehensive coverage of the entire region.

More rapid bus transit with dedicated lanes. Express light rail options leading out of town that don't stop as frequently down town would be great.
Consider making mass transit free as in some European communities. Operating costs are lowered and ridership is increased.

Make transit faster and more reliable by converting auto lanes to transit only lanes, particularly during peak periods.

Street safety at night. Lighting is poor.

This should be the number one focus of investments in transportation. Public transportation (TriMet mostly) needs to be expanded and made less costly so that people are not discouraged from using it due to poor schedules or lack of access. More bus shelters and safe places to wait for buses.

Convenient access, meaning easy walking distance, and good schedules of no less than three times an hour (and preferably four).

Undeserved Communities, Resident needs over tourist needs, express bus routes, frequency to specific destinations.

Current and projected use patterns vs. historical patterns. Making transit safe as well (lighting, location, security, etc). Making a priority of helping people get to work and back from all areas of the city over casual or tourist use.

Currently Portland rests on the laurels of having one of, if not the, most advanced and forward looking transportation systems in the nation, leading the way. However, the idea that public transportation needs to be profitable has slowed and stunted us badly, and without a correction of course, will soon leave us behind the pack. Strong public transportation systems are essential to a growing city, especially if that city wants to pride itself on equity and inclusiveness. We desperately need to avoid what I see as a coming death spin for Trimet. Reductions in state, federal and local funding of public transportation has forced Trimet to find alternative methods of funding, predominantly fair hikes and service reductions, to bridge the gap. Not only do these measures hurt the most impoverished and vulnerable segments of our society, they also act as a deterrent to people who are on the fence about trying out or continuing to use public transit. Lack of willingness and ability to ride means lower ridership than forecast, which turns into more deficits, which then demands further hikes and reductions, so on and so forth. We need to change the way we think about public transportation entirely. This is not a service or a commodity, to be measured in value solely by the bottom line. It is instead an essential public good, one of the

I generally think that investments should focus on getting the most service out of each dollar—effectively, more bus rapid transit over rail. With what's currently on paper, I wonder how clear priorities would be for service.

Safety—I generally hear people complain about "crime" (gasp) on Tri-Met. I know some of that is sensationalized by the media, but it does happen, and people do want to feel safe. Giving them the evidence (cameras, security presence, etc.) as well as advertising that fact, to give them the warm fuzzy feeling they are looking for.
Cycling is by far the most effective way to move through the city. We need to continue to work on the cycling infrastructure - more dedicated bike lanes, safer intersections, etc.

Increasing number of buses on crowded routes; improving and creating designated bike streets.

-Understanding why people currently do not use transit in order to know how to make it an attractive option. -Knowing where most ridership is to bump up frequency and accessibility. -Accuracy of schedules and visibility of drivers to other buses and people trying to make connections. My connections have been foiled many times by late buses and other drivers not waiting for people to unload.

Land-use, development, demographics

Walking and biking paths are the best if at all possible, it makes it a safer place for kids to start young and get used to walking and biking to places they need to go, also miss the fareless square.

Making certain that undeserved communities also benefit from these infrastructure improvements.

We should consider how much we are planning on spending and what type of projects will be money be used for.

Infrastructure investments in transit, particularly streetcars that operate in the roadway, should include (or at least not preclude) investments in bikeways on the same streets.

Integration of public transit systems.

Focus on low cost transit improvements (frequent bus, BRT - not LRT)) and improvements to pedestrian access to transit.

Actually making bus system work on time and with enough capacity on busy lines.

No new taxes or fees for consumers / businesses --> better use of current funds.

Covered bus shelters and protected bike lanes. Street safe sidewalks and paths everywhere in the city.

Courtesy and Behavior on bus and trains, stations and platforms.

Besides providing better choices for highly used corridors, look for underserved areas and make improvements there!

Accessible, affordable, and convenient transit is too key to present and future livability to stint planning and investing now. frequency is important; expanding service is important. build capacity!

Reduce fares increase bus service use taxes or fees from auto usage to pay for transit.

All traffic flows better when everyone follows the rules and contributes to development and maintainence. Bicyclists need to be licensed, pay fees, utilize safety equipment, and follow the rules of the road.

Making it more convenient to take transit than to drive . . . make driving *more* difficult / annoying in areas well-served by transit.

Social equity, increased frequency on more routes, finding ways to subsidize the costs, as it's a public good.

More rides at low cost- light rail may not need to expand much more.

Emphasize increasing frequencies, especially at off-peak hours.
Frequency of service, making sure people who depend on transit have it, connecting housing to destinations, flexible routes, operating transit.

As we increase density and decrease parking we need frequent transit more than ever.

More bus routes between popular destinations.

Be aggressive. I feel like I'm strapped to a bomb, with the threat of climate change destroying our planet and no governments doing anything to save us.

Reliability is a key ingredient, transit has to be consistently reliable, service delays whether bus or rail are killers when it comes to getting people to use the system. We should not over invest in system improvements that we can't afford to maintain, or which we don't bother to operate at a consistently excellent level.

I'd like to see communities served that aren't now convenient or easy to get to via transit. I'd like more light rail as it's faster and easier than bus. I'd like to see bus lanes and car pool lanes rather than any freeway expansions.

Transit should not only follow dense land use, but should be used to catalyze better places.

Investments should be paid for by all users, not just higher income taxpayers. Fuel taxes and bicycle licensing fees should be implemented.

Safety at bus stops increasing frequency of buses.

I agree with the aim but the policy is so broad: covering service levels, frequency, access, and cost that it maybe impossible to implement in an effective way. Anyone of these would make a laudable policy but all four at once seems to be a reach. I would want to see a focused plan breaking these down.

Equitable access for all incomes levels. Focus on serving low income areas and linking them to areas of employment and services. Identify and address the level of need for disabled users. Link transportation to regional ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS.

Reduce spending on auto use make transit more affordable increased use will make it more convenient reduce the price on shorter trips.

Since about 7% of the city use bike transportation I feel only 7% of the funds should be used for this. The balance should be used for decent sidewalks, to fix roads, have good street lighting, enough traffic lights and provide cheap parking for those who must use an auto.

Service expansion should consider flexible, non-traditional services in areas that are hard to serve by fixed-route transit. Regional policies should also ensure transit providers have incentive to coordinate and region should encourage private sector transit services to enhance or provide intercity services.

Driverless trains and busses, or Trimet will inevitably become a pension plan without any rolling stock! Driverless transit will be safer and more reliable than vehicles with drivers, and will leave more money for other public priorities.
Between the three systems (TriMet Bus, Lightrail, and Streetcar/WES) there seem to be redundancies and gaps. Even if these systems are managed and designed by completely different entities, can't a cooperative work together to maximize the returns? I can't help but be annoyed at weird bottlenecks of systems in West Portland (for example).

I feel the primary difficulty, in a sense, is addressing the problem of cars. Cars so much diminish our quality of life in both qualitative and quantifiable ways. Statistically, cars cause great damage to public health through air pollution, injury and death by accidents, and through encouraging a sedentary lifestyle. Then there is less unquantifiable: the ways cars diminish our quality of life through noise, stress, and threat (making our streets always a place of fear -- a place where we have to be always alert and on guard).

Serving communities currently under served. Providing reliable, frequent, affordable transportation to lower income areas.

Safety.

Please please please add more safe biking options on north/south streets on the east side. Please get rid of parking on 28th and make a big, safe bike lane. We live in the neighborhood and don't think it'll change parking that much. My husband was hit on his bike on NE 28th and Couch just this July.

Ease of connectivity, frequency and affordability.

More bus lines. More frequent buses. Not only a stop, but a turn around from the cutting of bus service over the past few years. Increasing fares while cutting bus service is a terrible way to encourage public transit.

Invest in more buses. Stop dumping money on boondoggles like light rail and trolleys, trams, etc.

The voices of those most disenfranchised and unable to use transit because it's too expensive.

Reliable and frequent north-south routes need to be implemented in SE Portland. Line 70 is a joke.

The cheapest is not necessarily the best, if you want to get people out of their cars.

Transit should be more frequent, accessible for all people and most importantly, affordable for everyone.

In addition to making infrastructure available for biking and walking, provide safety education to actually encourage cycling.

Transit in the core urban areas is already pretty good (especially to and from downtown). Focus on East Portland and other under-invested areas first.

By exploring ways to invest the government in public transit, we would show that our community values it. It needs to be affordable and reliable for many people to chose the bus over a car.

Population density, employment centers.

Convert outdated street design to pedestrian / bike friendly streets with landscaping. The street design of the peripheral areas of Portland is all car oriented and ugly.

Connections between various forms of transit - including easy ability to combine forms like walk, bike, ride.

Safety of bike/walk comuters - so they are actually safe and they feel that way.
Cross town mobility, servicing low income areas, ability to carry bikes.

I think expanding the transit system is more important than more bike routes.

Affordability and frequent service, including evening and night service, are critical to building ridership.

Active transportation incentives, complete neighborhoods.

Consider mixing modes of transportation: biking to light rail, biking to bus rapid transit, walking to transit, carpooling to transit.

Car/bike/pedestrian traffic does not co-exist. Cars hit bikes & pedestrians, bikes hit pedestrians. Make transit for EACH of these transportation systems safe. Lines painted on the streets do NOT protect cyclists. Bikes do not stop for pedestrians. The dominant bicycle attitude in the US is a racing cyclist mindset. That mindset needs to be adjusted.

Educating people and encouraging new riders to use the public transit system.

The current bike lane system is broken and terribly planned. There needs to be an active push to educate, and enforce intelligent biking. Cyclists choosing to ride up busy, narrow streets like lower SE Hawthorne, and NE 15th Avenue, endanger everyone. The same is generally true of downtown.

We need public investment. Lack of public investment is keeping the economy depressed. There is nothing wrong with government spending!

When considering new investments be sure to take the whole transit system into account. Also keep in mind that not all improvements need to come at the cost of auto traffic and roads.

Creating a transit system that is appealing for people who traditionally rely on cars.

Transit is a great connector - and equalizer - I come from NYC where the subway provides an extraordinarily quick and economical way to get places fast. I'd like to see us continue to invest in rail and in buses that are quieter and pollute less. frequency is important so is investing in buses that are more appealing - more buses, slightly smaller (so they don't hog other lanes) quieter and less polluting. Yes, that's a lot to ask. So what. We've been visionary and smart before, let's keep it up.

Make transit competitive with vehicle travel by making it faster - people will use it if it's faster than driving. This can be done by making transit faster or making driving slower.

Reducing conflicts between bikes and buses. In general, bus drivers are very accommodating, but when they share the right side of the road, it can get unsafe, particularly during peak commute hours.
Priority should be placed on service that can maximize ridership and serve neighborhoods with large populations of lower income people (who could benefit most from transit service). We should make investments that help buses run more efficiently: more queue jump lanes, dedicated lanes, some stop consolidation where they are more closely spaced than the international standard, more efficient fare payment systems that reduce dwell times, etc. We also just need more funding going to operations to run more buses to increase service frequency.

For transit service, frequency matters most. If a service isn't frequent, then it isn't convenient. I don't want to have to plan every minute of my day around transit service. Prefer to know it is there when I need it, even if I don't know when that may be. For bike infrastructure, the more visible the better. LOVE green bicycle lanes and bike boxes. This gives a clear signal to motorists that bicycles have priority.

Ideally the cost of now vs deciding to do it 20 years from now when it will be too late. I like fast tracking buses, as less infrastructure needs to happen, particularly for communities who continue to oppose light rail. But if traffic isn't moving, buses aren't going to moving either. Partnering with smaller bus systems is probably wise to get underway. Move commuters swiftly to larger transportation hubs.

Public transit is a community good; it should serve the parts of the community that can least afford alternatives to public transit. Plan routes to serve low socio-economic class neighborhoods and areas with employment, and provide 24-hour coverage to employees and employers who have shift work.

Wait times of 10-12 minutes at most.

Improve connections between outlying communities as opposed to bringing people from outlying areas to downtown.

Transit frequency.

We need 24 hour transit, with lots of options, especially around the 1am to 3am closing times.

Trimet is a for profit company and is in the business of making money. Any bus driver I've talked to says this with bitterness, that the welfare of the drivers and the community come last before the bottom line. Can transit become a public company? Can it be subsidized? Can it be free? I hate to see the battles with unions and the public that have taken place in the last years when public transit is so important to the health and welfare of our area.

I feel that the key to transit expansion is to make transit appealing to everyone. Including those who have easy access to cars. Transit needs to be part of a lifestyle that is appealing and that people will want to identify with.

Input from potential users, good research on usage patterns.

Transit should have priority over private motor vehicle use.

Costs to property owners, people who pay taxes.
Flexibility, affordability for low-income citizens, and resiliency to natural disasters (i.e., earthquakes and snowstorms). In other words, no more light rail, which is very expensive, inflexible, and not resistant to natural disasters.

Add sidewalks and trees to outer southeast Portland to make walking easier. Add more pedestrian crosswalks in southeast where growth has happened and where farmer's markets are now routinely held.

Housing density and putting jobs closer to neighborhoods, making village/neighborhoods that people want to live and work in.

Corporations like Nike and Intel and other corporations with more than 50 employees need to pay more in taxes. Every time the question of money comes up, the burden is shifted to homeowners and/or small businesses. Enough is enough!

Our number 1 priority needs to be SAFETY. That means more than it may appear on its surface... For instance, it is NOT safe on buses that travel over 15 mph to allow congestion to cause frequent standing in the aisles that would lead to serious injury in the case of an accident or sudden stop (see: http://emj.bmj.com/content/22/2/108.full). This also, however, extends to safety of reaching and standing at a transit stop, boarding and deboarding and safety of passengers and drivers en route. Finally, this includes safety of those outside buses and trains (for instance, why we do not have protective railings at train stops is beyond my conception).

Getting routes to east Portland more frequently. Having several 24 hour lines. It's silly that Portland's public transportation shuts down before many restaurant workers head home.

The indisputable fact that the majority of people in the region still want to use their cars for most trips.

Broader funding than currently exists for municipal transit systems.

Building neighborhood hubs with jobs, shopping, residential, etc. easy to access without a car.

Much more public transit. If you only add people and density and leave transit off the table what a mess. do not decrease buses just because there is max. Max is frequently not running or late or something.

It's a top priority as we increase density and discourage personal vehicles. More frequency, all-hours service (for ALL workers, including the janitors and bakers and health care workers that need to start work at 4am!), and affordability are HUGE.

Under served communities.

Transit should run 24/7. Right now it is often not available after bars close which creates dangerous situations. Those workers need transit too, and they often get off work well after closing time.

Regular commuters' fare should be a bit cheaper as honored or student fares are quite cheap. I hope weekly pass can be cheaper even if daily fare can't be changed.

More protected bike routes.

Linking to efforts to create work, shopping, entertainment and housing in continuous spaces.
Connecting further out places, as alternative transit use declines the further from the center of city one goes. Emphasis on rail and cycling infrastructures, as bus relies on motor vehicle and roadway use and walking not viable for much commute and errand running etc due to far flung layout of suburbs.

Without frequency and predictability, transit is a last resort transportation option. You use it when you can't get there another way. Also, our fares are outrageously out of sync with the level and frequency of service. We are as expensive as New York City and you can go just about anywhere in NY for $2.50.

Likely growth patterns, social equity, the best revenue source.

Improve biking routes in downtown Portland. The current infrastructure is a disincentive to prospective bike commuters due to limited bike lanes, bike lanes which disappear as you approach downtown from the Hawthorne bridge, buckled pavement, and clogged streets during rush hour.

In addition to all of the above, equity for all residents.

Safety for bikers and pedestrians and long term capacity.

It should be determined where and how increasing convenience, frequency, accessibility, and affordability would be most likely to lead to improvements, and prioritize those first.

Costs should be considered.

Low carbon transit, end the automotive emphasis and balance priorities among all transportation modes.

Talking to family and friends, many have reported that they don't take transit because it is more expensive than driving. Can transit actually be more affordable than driving? How, what will be done to make this happen. Consider people living in the suburbs– Hillsboro, Beaverton, SW, etc.

Equity. Better integration of bicycle and transit. Express service during peak hours.

Active transportation like biking and walking and skating should be a top priority.

Cost benefit analysis. Flexibility for changing transit needs. Resiliency in the face of natural disasters (e.g. earthquakes; snow storms).

Fiscal oversight is an absolute necessity. Too often public monies are spent on inefficient, overpriced niceties that do nothing do improve services to the public.

More money on bike infrastructure and bus services, as opposed to very costly light rail and street car projects. I can bike, and sometimes walk, faster than the streetcar.

Consider subsidized fares for low income individuals.

Making transit options more convenient for people with lower income. Making biking routes safer, to encourage more people to bike.

Frequency, accessibility and affordability. Although fares have increased over the years, frequency and accessibility of public transit has decreased.

That funds are not taken from street maintenance - no new "street fees."
Aim for service every 10 min! This will encourage those reluctant to use public transit due to not being convient. Add more train routes!!!

Ensuring that there is no net loss of ridership - if you build it and people are not using it, this means there is some gap re: the criteria you have listed here. For example, if the population climbs and there is not a net change of ridership taking the population gains into account - what does this mean?

Fare reduction; avoid the trap of thinking light rail is a cure all - it isn't. More expensive, less bang for buck than regular bus options.

POVERTY data, look at where low income people live and put transit there first. DISTANCE. where in our region are the greatest distances to the urban core and transit hubs to access jobs, healthcare, and education - how can we build networks?

North-South transportation, more rapid express lines, longer transfer periods.

Current areas of coverage (expand access), systems maintenance, frequency of service (the more convenient it is, the more attractive it is to use).

Can everyone - including low income - access work and shopping without being forced to drive?

Investments now will reap dividends in the future. We have to be thinking about the future.

Parking lanes could be bus only rapid transit lanes. Fewer stops with more options for transfer.

The future of transportation - how it should look to improve flow to anywhere in the city, ease of use and comfort.

Transit also needs to be safe—the transit centers and the bus and max lines.

The costs of the overall transportation system need to be considered. For instance, since municipalities generally subsidize on-street parking for automobiles, it means that it is often more convenient to drive - and the money spent to subsidize the cost of free parking cannot be spent in other portions of the transportation system.

Neighborhoods' input.

Low income persons, especially seniors, should get greatly reduced fares.

Safety and environmental impact are still to be considered major considerations.

More frequency.

Consider smaller buses to provide service to more areas.

Commute corridors that can be multi modal and used as recreation Safe pedestrian facilities, sidewalks and crossings.

Access to those who need it mot. Specifically cost, frequency and where service is expanded/provided.

How to make Portland as carfree as possible both for people's health and environmental cleanliness.

Reduced fares should primarily serve young people in order to make them transit users of the future.
Supporting frequency is the most important component to making transit a competitive choice against single occupancy vehicles.

Convenience and cost.

Distance people need to travel.

Cost of Transportation and safety.

It will be a challenge to make transit more frequent and more affordable. But maybe there are people who would take transit now, but the frequency isn’t convenient enough. I would also challenge the payment enforcement policy for the MAX and Streetcar. Instead of doing random stings, there should be a better way to just make sure everyone pays before they enter the train.

Service to suburban areas.

Usage.

Service improvements to dense areas where ridership increases are most likely (e.g. disadvantaged and urban communities) as opposed to projects located in farther outlying areas that are less likely to attract a substantial amount of riders.

More accessible - too many areas where if you don’t have a car, it is too far to walk to a bus stop. Maybe vans or smaller buses could be used as feeders.

We need high-frequency bus service and super short wait times for heavily-used corridors along Powell and other major connector streets.

Aesthetics, convenience.

How can we better connect more bike routes so that it’s easier to safely get around more of the city. All it takes are a couple of difficult/impossible/unsafe intersections on my bike commute to dissuade me from using bike transportation. We need more consumer education—better maps—that would enable bikers to better plan routes. We need to encourage more telecommuting... and consumer education/promotion toward evolving corporate culture to actively encourage less driving.

The time schedules of transit routes to accommodate commuter travel getting and coming from work. More buses and trains to take people working like Trimet does for special events downtown and at the Moda center.

Making transit convenient and affordable for low-income folks and not just the middle class.

Keep transit affordable and make it more convenient than driving.

Reduce bus stops to decrease trip time. Create more transit opportunities into SW and St John's. Provide reduced fares for low income families.

Flexibility of transit system - i.e. BRT rather than light rail, using technology to track ridership demands and routes. expand frequency and provide wifi on board.
Having a car is much more convenient right now and the savings you may get from taking the bus does not outweigh the inconvenience. You need to somehow equalize those factors.

Electric automobiles and the infrastructure to support them. Continuing to support bicycling. Safe, frequent, affordable service for low-income communities should be the priority.

Looking at work shifts & capacities (both workplace & transit vehicles) to adequately accommodate both office workers & shift workers.

That cars are the main mode of transportation in the metro area. Reliability.

Long-term up-keep of transit stations and technology. The system should always be seen as clean and safe in order to appeal to as wide a section of the community as possible.

Equity. Expanding transit options first for lower income neighborhoods.

Making it easier for people to walk and bike. For example, I live near Willamette Blvd., which recently got improved bike lanes. But Willamette also appeals heavily to cars, who often exceed the speed limit. And it is very difficult to take a left onto or off of Willamette by bicycle, especially with children. We've made Willamette a great route for cars.

How soon we can do it.

electric problems going over bridges; updating app for cleaner way to access schedule status updates.

The efficient fast flow of motor vehicles, abundant and free parking, as well as a mass culture that is pro-car and anti-bike are the biggest impediments to increasing alternative mode share in Portland. As long as those conditions exist throwing money at bike lanes, crosswalks, and other infrastructure only increases the already troubling trend of dividing folks by their travel modes. Drivers are getting more aggressive and bike lash is increasing in Portland (from my 2 wheeled street level experience) i know that we are Americans and we think that every problem is solved by throwing money at it, but in my opinion a bigger picture perspective and conversation would be the most productive action at this juncture.

Biking infrastructure-world class, lead the way.

Provide cards and expand apps that you can add funds to like a pre-paid card to use for public transit. Issue cards like a library card to increase the culture of people using public transit. Make it more affordable by increasing users to bring down the price point for riding. Replace the current Fare Inspectors or Transit Officers with Transit Ambassadors with higher emotional intelligence. The Transit Ambassador's can maintain safety and promote ridership. It's about establishing and nurturing a positive and friendly public transit culture through building a asset based relationship with the regions residents and businesses.

Low income areas, access for populations of color, sustainable funding processes.

Access to transit system for underserved communities.

Livability. I.e., make streets bike & pedestrian friendly. More public transit, etc.
Active transportation options, particularly involving children. Make it affordable for the people who need it the most. Come up with routes that cover the most ground. Run on time. Stop lining pockets at the top, which has happened in the past.

Connectivity to places people need to go; frequent service; travel time that are as fast as cars.

Social justice issues need more consideration. I understand that light rail projects are more often funded by federal dollars and therefore more likely to get traction, but the lowest-income neighborhoods are often not served by HCT. TriMet has cut bus service in many areas. Also, the cost of transit passes remains prohibitive for many I realize some of this is outside Metro’s purview, but it definitely needs to be considered in any transit planning. Also, traffic signals near transit stops need to be timed not just for vehicle and bike travel, but also for pedestrians. For example, lights near light rail accommodate trains and traffic but at least one light that I know of (crossing Interstate at the intersection with Multnomah), even a fast walker like myself can barely cross the street in the amount of time given. A disabled individual would have to cross the street using two separate walk cycles.

Transit has to be competitive with auto use for people to choose it. It should be frequent, reliable, and even fun. And it just has to serve the destinations people want to go to.

Motor traffic is seriously clogged during rush hours. It would be an advantage to encourage mass transit and park-and-ride options. Buses need to be more frequent, reliably on-schedule, and less crammed, so more people can take advantage of them.

Community cores should be built up so that we don’t NEED to commute as much. Outer East Portland needs sidewalks and bike paths. Some TriMet stops are pointlessly close to other stops, which is obviously wasteful.

Forget ridiculously pricey light rail, silly trolleys, etc. Buses (electric?!) go where people need to go, which can change. Buses don’t have lines that freeze up in winter. Buses don’t force people to go where it’s not convenient. Put more buses on the road where people want to go. Shuttles should move people from one popular ’hood to another (Belmont to Mississippi Dist., for ex.). Also, have regular service from PDX to college towns, the coast, Bend, etc.

Please make sure that outlying areas are considered, and not just busses to MAX stations, with runs that will take people to or from work before 6:00 am and after 9:00 pm.

Bus routes through low income communities.

Access to transportation for people who are earning below poverty wages.

Speed, flexibility and efficiency.

Make sure this is done equitably so that low-income residents have as much access to these amenities as everyone else.
963 97218 Seems the max lines should be connected. Keeping fares equitable. Build in transit incentives, free fares downtown, employee payback for using transit. Asking drivers to wait for customers while they are trying to cross a street or run to their connection, this is a sore spot for me. I find many of the drivers inconsiderate of riders.

964 97218 Travel time. I live 6.5 miles from work (half surface/half freeway). It takes 55 minutes by Tri-Met and 17 minutes by car. The time and physical wear & tear are worth my parking fees. Cut the Tri-Met time to 30 minutes and we'll talk.

965 97218 Greater frequency to extended areas. More parking at satellite transit stops. Easier physical transfer from bus to light rail. More light rail.

966 97218 Better options for frequent active/public transportation users and communities on the outer boundaries of Portland to use active/public transportation to reach other parts of the city without long wait times.

967 97218 The income levels and ages of people in the neighborhood, as well as their transportation patterns. For instance, some people may drive their kids to school because they are driving to work anyway. But in another neighborhood, people want to walk their kids to school, don't have a car, and don't have sidewalks or crosswalks.

968 97219 • Make operators State employees, pool existing pension obligations and contributions into PERS. • Smaller, more frequent electric or hybrid buses on lighter usage routes. • Transport on demand in areas not served (expansion of lift program). • Equalize pay and benefits for bus and lift operators. • Expand light rail and consider using a freeway lane in each direction where necessary and practical for light rail. • Make mass transit the priority over automobile traffic expenditures. • Disregard political considerations when evaluating best practices.

969 97219 Adaptability of the system - can we create a transit system that operates under a wide variety of conditions? If not, people may be less willing to give up a car (for example, if the system doesn't operate at night, or during winter storms).

970 97219 Safety, and a fossil-fuel-free future scenario. Can a transit system be good enough (reliable, flexible, clean, safe) to attract twice as many riders in the next 20 years? What will it need to do to accomplish that?

971 97219 Provide MUCH more frequent transit service--and space the bus stops MUCH farther apart! That way, people will wait half as long for buses AND get from A to B in half the time once on the bus! There is absolutely *zero* need to have a bus stop every 2-3 blocks when we have the nation's shortest blocks! If someone is truly severely disabled, they will know where to go or what options are available.

972 97219 Walkability, not destroying neighborhoods, green spaces (parks not parking strips), renewable power (solar). Current home owners investments.
Encourage or even require major employers to institute direct shuttles from suburban campuses to metro neighborhoods. I can't get from Multnomah Village to Nike in less than 90 mins each way. By car it takes 30 minutes. A direct shuttle for my SW coworkers and I could remove dozens of cars from the road for lower cost than expanding buses, MAX and streetcar service.

Dedicated bus lanes I live in SW Portland and probably will never see light rail anywhere near where I live.

Need more frequent bus service.

Reduced fares and whatever it takes to reduce auto use.

Buses are more flexible than debt ridden light rail. There are private bus companies that have filled gaps based on areas of public demand.

There should be a strong focus on underserved areas, such as the West Hills. Public transportation is spotty there. Furthermore, the hub system (in which I have to go downtown before over to Beaverton) makes my trip almost 4 times as long as driving and twice as long as cycling.

Reliability and frequency is very important in a transit system...TriMet has been lacking in this area.

Improving access may require a variety of sources for funding the necessary infrastructure improvements plus, changing the culture of driving everywhere. The community, elected officials and businesses will need to be involved and on board.

Stop building two-car light rail "train" lines and take people where they want/need to go in a timely manner using buses.

Develop more off-street walking & biking paths.

Most "bang for the buck" - - determine which options and improvements will cause people to take transit instead of drive cars.

Where jobs are, and the shift times. Non radial service improvements.

Traffic enforcement for cars. Even great walking/biking routes can be ruined by speeding drivers, not holding in place while crosswalks are used, etc.

Should focus on making transfers across the river easier. division, etc has great restaurants but to have to go downtown from SW means that I will never take the bus there!

The psychological aspects of why people won't get out of their cars & into public trans.

Low income areas, senior populations, transit dependent folks.

Realistic transit prices for working families. By making service more frequent, more people are apt to ride; at this time many people do not ride public transit because it is such an inconvenience. Also, creating a resources for carpooling/ride sharing.

We need a stronger transit police presence on buses. Often, loud, disruptive, noxious, loaded, etc. people stress out the packed-in, well-behaved passengers on a bus and the driver can't do anything about it. Just having a transit officer present would help keep things civil.
Obviously, how to pay for it. Need more buy-in and support from business community. It's in their interest to improve transportation to the core area. Portland has done a great job with the SE/NE area in terms of transportation. Now it is time to focus on the SW area—transpiration in and around Beaverton, Tigard and Tualatin—especially where the voters have said no to light rail. If not light rail, then what is the solution to the traffic nightmare.

Make bus service more frequent, less crowded, more affordable and in more places. Many people I work with just decide to drive and pay parking because it is about the same price as a monthly bus pass.

Most cost effective means.

Implementation should include new routes, increased frequency on some existing routes as well as new modes of transit like rapid bus service and more streetcars.

How to keep costs affordable for the working poor and others that use mass transit as their only means of travel.

How it will be funded. And making sure the less wealthy neighborhoods/areas are well-served.

Neighborhood livability/viability. Never sacrifice neighborhoods to the god of the easy commute.

Keep costs affordable—esp. for seniors, disabled, lo-income. Continue passes for all high school youth (None of my 4 kids drove until they were in college). Bike and walking connectivity are critical—in SW using TriMet is a challenge—our closest bus access is 1 mile away, not so bad in dry weather and daylight, but in the evenings an accident waiting to happen. Also, rethink the transfer/time length policy—again, in SW any trip involves extra time.

Our population is getting older, more diverse, denser, and more stratified. More people than ever will *never* have need of a driver's license. The car may be king, but walking, biking, and busing are the only options for senior citizens, Millennials swimming in student loan debt, and immigrants.

Consider that we don't actually have what I would call transportation equity. That is, the central urban area (Portland) has a grid system and higher urban densities that support a more efficient transit system and that's where the majority of investments occur and therefore the most frequent transit service. The suburban areas have less of a grid system, lower densities and there is less investment in transit service and these areas pay more for less transit service.

Transit speed and frequency is key to encouraging people to use the available systems. It is unfortunate that TriMet has decreased services over the last couple of years. Bring back Fareless Square and increase all services.

Engaging city, county and state partners to prioritize improving transit trips. This may involve improvements to existing car-oriented infrastructure. The public needs to be educated that we have a large aging population who may not always be able to or who shouldn't get around by car.
Artery expansion to the full population of Portland and surrounding cities (e.g. Max to SW and to Vancouver), as well as critical gaps in the existing network.

More frequent assessment of the needs of each neighborhood.

How to make public transit faster.

I would love to see some sort of discount for people who use public transit to commute, even if it's just by making the monthly pass less expensive than buying individual tickets.

Make sure to include all of Portland not just the east side.

The input of all stakeholders should be invited and reduced to data points.

Reducing the number of transfers required to get from A to B. Use smaller vehicles on low demand routes and low demand times.

Include neighborhood short routes for connectivity to other bus and tram lines as well as to the Main Streets and business areas.

What Bus Lines are most used and those Lines should have the most Frequent Service available to commuters. Also Lines such as the 43 which our Saturday service was taken away in 2010, should be looked at seriously now to restore our Bus service, which may mean cutting a line less used on Saturday. I think Bus 43 needs to be treated as fairly as many of the other Frequent used lines on Saturday because it's a very used bus line and the people who primarily depend and live on the line have no way of getting anywhere on the weekend. I feel it's our turn to have our service looked at again now and restored so people can get around on Saturday.

Please acknowledge that most people use automobiles. Transit and bicycles are not the answer for the majority of the people. Consider alternatives to highways for freight not people.

Funding and equity, e.g. making sure all areas and neighborhoods are treated the same way.

The importance of bike/pedestrian lanes in SW Portland.

Relative easy of implementing policy with options such as electric buses and less costly technology than rail....very expensive and limited use.

Increasing frequency of buses.

Reducing traffic & pollution.

Increasing the desire to take public transit.

The needs of the poor, who are being pushed from the inner city, which has many transport options available, to the distant suburbs, which has few transport options available.

Don't assume that light rail is the best option - buses that enter neighborhoods make more sense for people who, for one reason or another, cannot easily walk to a main street (where light rail tends to be).

The answer is yes, but. The but is that we need to balance limited resources to ensure that all modes of transportation are safe and convenient.
First, pedestrian and bike safety. Second, reducing reliance on burning carbon.

Fairness and equity. Ask the question Who is benefiting from this the most? If it continues to be those with decent transit options then taking alternative forms of transit will continue to merely be one option for those with many options. There are terribly unsafe streets in outer SW Portland with no shoulders on the roads, let alone sidewalks. Biking is extremely treacherous in SW - and I believe that we should start investing in bike paths OFF the sides of roads - entirely separate from the streets. Look to Boulder, CO or even the Corvallis/ Philomath area.

Providing the most frequent service to our communities - to jobs, to schools, to services, and to shopping areas (centers).

Access to key destinations, improved pedestrian access to transit stops especially in or to centers and corridors.

People who use multiple methods of transit during one trip, such as cycling and MAX or bus.

Cost of Bike/Walk versus Auto Lanes New Buildings provide for Bike/Walkers -- storage, showers.

Cost, efficiency and locations.

Safety for non-motorized commuters.

Alternatives to car traffic. Safety. Environmental impact.

Focus on underserved areas (such as outer SW Portland).

More direct walking and biking routes would be great.

As much as I like rail, I believe that bus expansion is so much more configurable that it should be ranked higher than rail.

Real-time updates at high-frequency transit stops to give riders greater confidence, expanding to SW, where there is huge demand for greater transit access.

Making cycling options more attractive to people by improving safe bike routes, away from vehicle traffic.

Safe and convenient (as much as possible) alternatives to single-occupancy cars.

Maximum diversity in transit options as well as finding options.

Pedestrian separation from Bike Lanes.

Business could offer incentives for public transportation and walking and biking to work.

Health impacts of air pollution should be the most important factor.

Do not charge for bus and metro trips. Pay for it with an increase in the gas tax (Salem will have to be involved).

Equity of access - seems to me the East side has many more public transportation options that west side. I live in an area which is only just getting side walks and Max is not an option because it doesn't come to the SW - Multnomah village area.

Adding more safe walkable routes in SW Portland.
More bicycle awareness of traffic rules. More bike lanes in SW Portland.

Density.

Equity, the environment our kids and grandkids will inherit.

Bicycling safety, frequency of bus routes.

Propinquity of transit stops to residential areas. Keep in mind that many senior citizens are both more transit dependent than average and unable to walk more than a few blocks.

People are selfish and lazy, and they want services to be free.

Efficiency and speed of the transit options. Citizens living in the outer parts of the city can spend two hours each direction when taking public transit to work. This makes it an unreasonable alternative for many.

Building codes / future development for higher density (urban infill) needs to consider easy transportation access (bike lanes, mass transit access) into their plans on the front end.

Transit should be available to the working class who does not work 9-5 Monday through Friday.

I'd like to see more investment in safe pedestrian access to transit stops. In my neighborhood the bus service is pretty good but in places like Halsey, it's very difficult to cross due to the width of the road and the traffic speed. There are aspects to transit beyond the actual bus/train, etc like safe access to the transit stops.

On-street parking should not be eliminated.

Build personal rapid transit. It's a pod system that uses separate guideways for stations, so you go non-stop from origin to destination.

Identify areas of traffic congestion, peak travel times, then plan transit lines accordingly. Create park-n-rides. Create designated "transit only" lanes.

Transporting people safely, conveniently and quickly from one place to another.

How far people actually travel on transit and where they go. The fact that you have to go downtown to get most places is silly. You should also look at the lack of decent sidewalks and safe places to walk and bike without removing all the streets and making the congestion worse. There needs to be a balance. Transit also needs to be safe as well.

Consumer fares must always been kept low and without yearly jumps in prices, buses need to run more often and access areas not currently in the system, tickets should last longer and prices for seniors must never, never go up.

Cost to individual in the form of increased taxes, especially increased property taxes. My family is very low-income and live in a tiny home in outer East County that we struggle to pay for every month, yet our property taxes are larger than those of larger houses in more economically affluent neighborhood in Portland. I also have concerns about renters who use a great deal of public transportation not being financially responsible for any improvements made to public transportation. Please address the uneven taxation issues if implementing improvements paid for by individual taxes of one sort of another. Thank you very much.
Clean, safe bus stops. Possible neighborhood issues with traffic, need, price, frequency.

Where those that need it most live and need to go.

Many people in the community walk and many more would walk if we had sidewalks in our neighborhood. Especially on 111th between Halsey to the end of the neighborhood and in between 102nd and 122nd. Biking route over 205 on Halsey would also make biking safer. Bus service is sufficient to meet the needs of the residents. However, cost is still an issue. Reduced fares would be helpful. $5 a day is very expensive for folks in poverty - and the majority of my neighborhood is living below the poverty level.

Transit should be free.

Where people travel to and from to make it easier to get from the outlying areas without having to go downtown.

Accessibility and frequency of service to low income neighborhoods outside the core of city.

Humans and life not automizing autos.

Demographics, determine frequency of use.

Infrastructural improvements that increase low-socioeconomic income safe-access to transit while doing so in an economically-accessible manner to this same population.

What should always be considered is that carbon fuel-based single-occupant vehicle transportation is not a sustainable method to move ourselves around with!

How increased density along transit corridors promotes the efficient use of transportation dollars.

Two main factors keep me from using transit: 1. It is too far to a stop and 2. It takes too long. More busses with more stops coupled with more trains (and lines) with fewer stops.

Create housing density to allow public transit to serve those areas more extensively. Recognize that public transit will never pay for itself from the users, so be willing to provide sufficient public funding.

Safe walkways for access.

How to promote transit with supportive land use (e.g., higher densities within a short distance from transit stations/stops).

Divert funding from roadway capacity projects that simply encourage more driving and low density development with segregated land uses.

all options should be considered to give people choices. To limit highway construction, rapid bus lanes, more bike lanes, and sidewalks for walkers should all take precedence.

Fully meeting residents' transit needs means making transit available -- at some level, at least -- 24/7 region-wide. Many graveyard- and swing-shift workers are transit-dependent, and transit-dependent residents can't take advantage of social, educational, and cultural opportunities if the bus or train has stopped running by the time an evening or weekend event concludes.

Be sure those who must rely on public transit have access as needed.
Sidewalks, sidewalks, sidewalks. Portland lacks sidewalks for safe walking to school & work. Why is there no park and ride for the MAX for SW Portland? There is no place to park - long term as in for at least 4 hrs and catch the train into downtown.

providing more frequent service and service to SW Portland.
Need of local riders, not just ridership counts.
Poorer people and older people should have more access.
Parking structures near main transit centers must be sized to accommodate people who don't have walking/biking access - the Beaverton Transit center is useless for many people because no parking is available. Walk/bike is just fine for 40 percent of the population, but you don't solve problems by ignoring people who don't consider a 3-4 transfer, 2 plus hour commute to be reasonable. Those people WOULD drive the first segment to a transit center, if they could park-&-ride and be at work with 1 transfer and less than an hour commute, compared to a 30 minute direct drive to work. Quit imposing walk/bike as the only legitimate criteria to access bus/rail! You are unrealistic!

Sustain service in areas that already rely on transit, but also provide new options to neighborhoods that currently do not have reliable transit, such as those where service ends too early for many commuters or doesn't provide routes for shopping or other errands. In general, there is a lack of north-south routes on the west side that don't require changing downtown.

How to do implement it as quickly and efficiently as possible.
I want the region to invest more in making biking and walking safe and convenient. Biking and walking projects are inexpensive, create jobs, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and provide many other benefits to our health, neighborhood safety, livability, and economy.
That certain regions like Clackamas County that have been swayed by the BS coming from the Tea Party and their puppet masters to avoid real, useful mass transit be taken with a grain of salt. They will be screaming for it in a few years.

Equity of access (affordability) Overall environmental impact of transportation system options Last mile transit that's convenient (supports car-free living) bike routes that are dedicated (safe) and possibly even rain sheltered.
Targeting low income areas for mass transit and making safe connections from mass transit to neighborhoods.
Focusing on areas of the region most likely to use the improvements.
Ticket prices/affordability.
Incentivize longer transit trips.
Cost to users and safety.
I have supported light rail but I think we need to look closer at high-capacity bus lines, increased bus service, and improved bike facilities and infrastructure.
Equitable distribution of service improvements, especially in outer SE neighborhoods.
The entire spectrum of transit not just the public transit and bike transit that are mentioned here. This question is not properly worded.
Connect with businesses to offer incentives to their employees when they use alternative transportation...ie. biking, bus. Like OHSU does.
Expanding light rail and dedicated bus lanes and making sure the public transportation system in the Tri-county area is efficient, coordinated and responsive to residents transportation needs.
How it will affect vehicular traffic. Though I love alternative transportation, I still often drive.
Population density and demographics along transit routes, linkages to other routes and light rail, rate structure needed to support.
Bike accessibility, separate pedestrian / biking areas / lanes.
I think building safe and direct walking/biking routes should be focused on above the rest. Then work on expansion.

Cross city commuting without having to go through downtown Portland needs to be available. I currently live in Milwaukie and work in Beaverton, and being able to do this commute by public transit without going through downtown Portland would save much time on my commutes.
The first consideration should be serving those most in need, then figuring out how to pay for it, rather than first thinking of what will make the most money.
Metro needs to spend less time focusing on the "mode" of transit - we need to end our policy of "light rail, only light rail, and nothing but light rail" and focus on the NEED of transit - and then how to best address it. Buses are particularly effective for much of our region's transit needs, but Metro has been particularly biased against buses because there is no payback for developers who support the construction spending associated with massive light rail projects. Citizens and riders come first - not developers.
Commute needs, connection between housing and transportation costs, access to work is an equity issue.
Maximizing the investment. Investing tax dollars where they will do the serve the greatest number of people in a fiscally responsible manner.
Keep the cost of public transit down for short trips. Currently I would spend more on public transit than on gas for my vehicle for my work commute.
Consider elevated trains in areas where expansion of space is not possible.
Gaps in the bike lane, sidewalk, and multi-use path system should be filled in as quickly as possible.
Start designing a passenger only rapid transit system by tunneling below existing Max lines downtown and other places for transfer on the surface. Don't waste the time we lose bumping through downtown and all the way to Gresham on systems that are limited by our Portland short blocks, just to start at most short sighted.
Portland to Salem MAX line, preferably down the I-5 corridor so that drivers can see the train go whizzing by while they are stuck in traffic.

Trimet should abandon the use rail for transit and focus on buses. The expense of rail is unsustainable.

Rail and bus systems are great if they go where you want to go and you're not in a hurry. Tri-met works best for those who commute regularly, and only once per day from the suburbs into Portland and back. My work takes me all over the city randomly. It would be impractical to use public transit because the travel time would exceed the actual hours on the various sites.

What level of frequency is required to make transit convenient. I know I live in an area where nearby transit happens mostly at 1 hr intervals, and stops after rush hour, so it isn't convenient.

Transit should be about people - NEVER about developers or construction companies. Metro needs to stop letting these special interests dictate what transit projects get completed, and put citizens first, foremost, last, and only, as the deciding factor. If a company like Siemens says they know what is best - they are trying to sell you a light rail train. That should be a red flag, not an invitation.

As much public opinion should be solicited (town hall-type meetings, online surveys, social media) to determine the priorities of the people who actually use public transit as opposed to people who may not be directly impacted by the decisions they make.

Growth regions.

In this order: cost of implementation/construction, cost of operation, needs of community.

Affordability: talk with businesses about helping employees pay for monthly or annual passes by encouraging employers to pay a portion of the amount. Convenient/Frequency: Expand frequency of buses that go into suburbs, such as Tigard and Tualatin. Consider expanding weekend evening schedule for Lines that serve Washington Square Mall later into the night. Accessible: Help accessibility by building lights at stops, covered areas for rain, and clear walking paths away from busy traffic.

Ensuring that ALL RESIDENTS are treated fairly and equitably; that transit investments are done to benefit citizens FIRST, FOREMOST and ONLY - that lobbyists by the light rail and construction and contractor lobbies are NOT allowed to influence or be a part of transportation decisions. Light rail should only be built IF it is the best mode, AND that bus service is under absolutely, positively NO negative impact. If buses are cut in one part of town to favor light rail elsewhere, that is a violation of making transit better for our region.

Flexibility and getting the most out of every dollar spent. Minimizing costly studies and wasteful contracts.

Effectiveness of new designs in expanding the user base which will provide the revenue stream for to increased frequency and lower fares.

Helping those in greatest need first. Be sure to have availability to low income and special needs people.

How to do it without screwing up the flow of normal traffic. In other words, DO NOT sacrifice traffic lanes to enhance transit capabilities.
Serving the low-income, disabled, youth and senior communities - making sure they have nearby access and lower fares with convenient routes to the essential services that they need.

Cost, safety, environment, practicality.

Please put more focus on walking routes with sidewalks, safe crossing, etc.

Where the biggest population gains will be, so transit can be in place where the most newcomers will live.

We need to connect more dots with inter city routes that aren’t TOTALLY centered around downtown Portland and put a CHEAPER rapid transit underground system to service downtown routes with trains that aren’t limited by the city block size. Bigger trains and a CLOSED tunnel system could be made almost totally automated, and constructed without screwing up the streets!

24 x 7 transit system. With manufacturing companies large and small working 24x7, if you don’t work a day shift, it makes it hard to get around on transit. Please increase parking at Sunset Transit Center and other major park and ride hubs, this is critical to ridership. I work and go to school so my time is precious. I have yet to find a parking spot at Sunset Transit Center at 11 am to ride into Portland for my afternoon classes and to take a bus extends my travel time by 30 minutes, which makes me late for class, so I have to drive downtown from Beaverton.

Daily commuting needs, especially locations not currently connected to public transit. Also special event needs (i.e. increase transit service for large events like Rose Festival).

Availability of bike paths/lanes, public transportation connections across the network (not just north-south or east-west).

Study the policies of Zurich, Switzerland.

Bring public transportation out into the suburbs.

Do not spend any money expanding light rail.

Over all transit time reductions per $ spent. Increased safety pre $ sprint.

Light rail beats buses. Extend the current system in the SW.

We need to be smarter about what alternatives work the best. For example, as the population ages, fewer people will ride bikes to work. I'm 68 years old and I'm not going to try to get 3 bags of groceries home on the bus. I am not going to carry my golf clubs onto mass transit even if it went to the golf course where I want to play. Put mass transit in the places where it can move large amounts of people on frequently traveled routes (primarily the daily commute) but don't forget roads serve needs too and they need to operate efficiently too ..something they surely don't do right now.

There should be elements of short-term gain to entice those who are resistant to the ideas, but ultimately, the long-term gains should be the guiding factor in policy creation.

A minimal impact on existing transportation systems and a minimal amount of tax payer dollars.

Make transit faster. Reduce the number of stops between Tigard and downtown.
Making more affordable includes the cost of the projects. Do not force expensive light rail on communities. Concentrate on developing a system to get one-person-per-vehicle off the roads. Give extensive attention to the effect of driverless cars and what portion will be electric drive. Where does light rail go? How can we have more frequent service in the most common commute routes? Affordable fares. $5 a day might be cheaper than my car in the end, but it sure doesn't feel like it. While I support this concept in general, it's misleading to ask without quantifying or explaining trade-offs. While we need more transit, we need to get away from the hub and spoke system (TriMet's service area plans get to this) and we also need investment in roads, an area this region has critically ignored.

Environmental factors, getting people where they need to go. Aging population. We cannot all ride bikes. I think one must consider the future at least as much as the present. It appears fewer and fewer young people want to live in the suburbs like I do. I have to take my care to get anywhere and to shop for anything. I do not like this. Strengthen transit in such a way as folks can live close by. Do not use the Beaverton Round as an example of what to do. It is not conducive to folks living there tho the property near by could be, if the owner would only move forward in a meaningful and community friendly way.

The more people on public transportation, the fewer cars on the road. Also, there are places where the nearest bus stop requires quite a walk. Having more extensive routes would be beneficial. How on earth to get the outer (and even inner) suburbs to buy in. (I live in one.) listen closely to their concerns and objections to see if there is a way to satisfy them. maybe it's just a knee-jerk 'no.' somehow get them to feel like a part of the portland metro area and drop the us vs them attitude.

Environmental impact. Making mass transit attractive by having attractive vehicles that move as or quickly than private cars. Quick and easy movement around the metro area. Reduction in green house gasses. making more areas accessible to public transit. The temptation in this day and age is to make things more complicated than they need to be just because we can. We don't always have to use the latest technology is we have a basic foundational system that works. Focus on that! Get the buses to where people actually need to ride ~ smaller and more frequent if that is how they are used. Only use MAX where there are corridors used by large numbers of people. Make it safe to use bikes and small cars. I live in a quiet residential neighborhood but it is between BH Hwy and Canyon Road. I have all shopping nearby. But I take my life in my hands riding my bike to the grocery store which is ten minutes ride. Get back to basics and people will get out of their cars.

Size of transit vehicle should be commensurate with number of riders. Need more capacity at park and ride. Need more park and ride (example would be Beaverton for MAX). Walkability to transit options.
Increase frequency in areas where it results in greater usage; reduce fares in areas of lower income.

 Ridership in the areas. Most important, have a community meeting and truly listen to the people and the transportation needs. Here in Cedar Hills TriMet had 2 meetings and totally failed to listen or take serious one of the many great ideas we had.

 The traffic congestion in the Portland Metro Area is getting worse every year, if public transit was more widespread and most of all affordable for all - not just for those listed in the policy information provided - more people would use it. I know I would.

 Prioritize walking, bicyclists, and buses. Cars must pay a fare when entering the metro area, based on demand pricing.

 1 population so the most are served 2 the future, meaning when you plan transit plan that the transit will bring more folks to it. This is an indirect way to get population to move and concentrate 3 consider East Portland, not West a model as we on the West are too spread out and can not reach transit without a considerable walk. We have built ourselves the perfect "I need a car world here on the West Side.

 There's a chicken & egg aspect to making this work; the service needs to be available before people will give it a try, and it takes time to change people's habits. patience.

 The bus stop near my home was made bad: Tri-Met took out the shelter and even the bench. Yet, if you ever take the bus on SE Powell Blvd, there's a shelter with benches about every 3-4 blocks. How fair is that?

 This leaves out safety. As someone who has been a long time rider of public transit and who has free access to it I am now looking for a vehicle due to the lack of safety. It will never be convenient, accessible or affordable for riders as long as it remains unsafe.

 Non fossil fuel vehicles and systems.

 Improved convenience and frequency will increase ridership, therefore positively impacting the other goals.

 Cost benefit of the product being funded.

 How to incentivize people to use transit and how to deincent use of the automobile. Make transit very convenient and affordable.

 Make transit comparatively more attractive than private cars.

 That transit is not a money maker but an Important service to the whole community.

 Better more frequent connections in suburban areas. reducing traffic on freeways and main arterials.

 The Sunset Transit Center parking garage was full from day 1 of its opening. All the bus routes were canceled, even though their were promises not to cancel bus routes when the Max came to the area. The STC parking garage is full by 7:10 am every week day. As a result, I never use it, because I arrive at 7:15 am and can't park. So I drive all the way downtown.

 Areas that need the most help and have been neglected due to earned income.
Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits - Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles - Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit - Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life - Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals - Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency.

Improve neighborhood access [ie formalize informal/herd trails such as along the 95th right of way by St Vincents.]

Maximize access, first to low-income suburbs, then to higher-income suburbs, then finally to higher-income urban dwellers.

Making sure that the existing infrastructure is being maintained - Orange Lines being built while Tri-Met has numerous maintenance issues at the Rose Quarter with failing switches, etc.

Width of streets for transit options, providing trash receptacles at transit stops.

Please prioritize the people and areas that need transit the most, and rely on it--lower-income individuals and families and service industry/blue-collar workers. 1) Better, more accessible, frequent, reliable service to further-out communities that are underserved and of lower-income. 2) Why on earth does transit shut down before bars close? Public transit should run through 4am minimum. As it stands, there is no way for intoxicated people to safely take transit home when the bars close at 2:30 (encouraging drunk driving), AND the service workers who have to close the bars have no public transit option to get home, forcing them to drive, cab, or get stuck across town.

Increasing frequency, improving connectivity between modes (bike to train, bus to train, etc) and reducing fares. Simplifying fares would be good, too. For instance, buy a transit card that you can charge up, or pass that works like an automated toll-reader and just charges you when you get on. OR be able to buy a ticket on the train within 2 minutes of boarding or something.

Increasing frequency and access of transit, particularly bus lines is my top priority and will make the most significant difference for lower income Oregonians.

Implementation: Who gets benefits first. Where are they concentrated?

Closer to home, more auto congestion will encourage people to walk, bike and take max. The less bikes and max have to slow for cars the more inviting these alternative modes are to those stuck in traffic.

But at what cost.. some of these "good ideas" just don't pencil out.

Better, more efficient transit in the suburbs.

Safety, efficiency, organization, cost effectiveness, low fares, eliminate school buses and give children reduced on mass transit instead.
What methods of transport move the greatest number of people in the shortest amount of time. Don't go with what is "cool" or "trendy." Buses generally provide the most efficient transportation. Bicycles on roadways slow everyone down and probably result in more carbon pollution than is reduced by taking one person out of a car.

Need more convenient alternatives to single occupancy vehicles -- for transportation management, and climate change response.

Swing/night shift workers have a difficult time using modes of transportation other than a car due to their odd hours.

Commuting patterns and metro travel routes.

Proximity of affordable housing to transit system stops.

Matching transit infrastructure (dedicated lanes, light rail/trolley tracks) to existing and projected development patterns.

Do not take away/reduce roadways to do this. Stop concentrating on MAX, which is a finite system which cannot grow with the population.

More park and ride facilities.

Long term operating cost Balance work, shopping, school and recreational destinations.

Convenience for people to not drive. One comment is that I see no value in a trolley since it is just a very expensive bus.

Flexibility. No fixed rail systems. Use bus lanes and articulated buses to achieve this goal.

More PUBLIC transport, i.e. mass transit; ensure that land use regulations put housing close to mass transit (MAX in particular).

Disruption during construction is huge- there needs to be a plan to at least maintain status quo while working toward improvements.

A realistic perspective on our energy future, and future population and funding.

Tax and government policies need to be more supportive of small businesses so services can be more locally obtainable. Large business tend to concentrate services because it is efficient for them but not necessary community friendly.

Fast trains -- MAX should not be encumbered by street traffic, particularly stop lights & signs. Plenty of parking adjacent to MAX stations -- no more fiascoes like the lack of parking by the Sunset Transit Center. Good bicycle routes and/or bus routes between suburbs and MAX stations.

I would consider convenience of transit system. The Max needs to have a fast route through town with larger transit centers. Local routes are cool but it is time to step up the game; bury that thing and provide express routes.
Need more sidewalks within the Portland Metro area so families and children can walk safely to bus stops, schools, libraries etc.

Washington Co. has only feeder service. Is there an innovative and COST EFFECTIVE way to provide transit within the communities in the county?

Smart planning–not "cool" planning. Buses are efficient people movers; rail, less so.

Cost -- i've got concerns about how much Tri-met personnel make (the burden of cost for healthcare AND management's compensation); safety -- are bike routes safe enough for cars and bikes to share the road and is there adequate lighting (where possible/feasible).

Reducing single-occupant vehicular traffic and associated heavy traffic/gridlock and congestion; reducing environmental pollution; reducing health problems associated with traffic; reducing effects of climate change.

Motion activated lighting; smaller buses for light use times.

How to help people realize how they can use it.

How financing will negatively impact low wage earners.

The most economical way to provide the transit service.

Not sure.

The links between transit systems. For example, I take the Max to work but hate the lack of parking at the station. When it's pouring rain and dark, it's uncomfortable to walk the long distance from street parking on the other side of Hwy 26 to the Sunset Max station. If parking were adequate, I would LOVE riding the Max and would not look for personal justifications to drive instead.

Input from areas and populations that are currently underserved or not served at all. For example, I would use the bus if it came more reliably, more often during the day (not just during the commuting hours in the morning and evening), and was not a one-direction circular route. I live off NW 119th Ave (97229), and can easily walk to a stop on 119th, but returning home I have to spend way more time and go completely out of my way because the bus only travels one way on a loop route (#50). My kids travel more on the bus than me, and say that sometimes they either don't come, are really late or really early. Can be hard to work out a trip if connections are not reliable, esp. getting to a job on time without having to be an hour or more early, just to make sure. Talk about a time waster!

Restoring service that has already been cut then adding more service to areas that are growing and are not currently being serviced or are underserved.

Phased implementation with locked-in completion that minimizes "back-sliding."

Don't make paying for it regressive or on retirement property values. It should be something that all do pay for, but don't penalize the poor, out of work or fixed income types.

People will only use transit if it is convenient.
Bicycle parking as well as adding safe access for walking and biking to MAX and bus stops.

Keep service quality standards and reliability high as first priority. Improve greatly accessibility to MAX for park & ride.

West side transit is poor (Washington County). Makes it very difficult to choose transit as an alternative to driving.

New solutions for far-flung neighborhoods that are now un or under-served by TriMet. Take over TriMet!!

This is a poorly written question, so much so that I almost voted "no". Public transit is not the same thing as bike paths at all. Public transit is lightly used because it is much slower than private cars (2-3 times as long to commute from, say, Bethany to Portland by public transit as by car) and expensive (e.g., no family/multi-person rates, making it cheaper to drive if you have as few as two people in a car). Further, there is grossly insufficient parking at transit centers, making even reaching public transit so difficult that tips the balance to private commuting. Finally, public transit does not equal more light rail, despite what Portland and Metro government seem to think. Summary, I would support certain types of investment in public transit. Secondly, bicycles do not equal public transit. A bicycle is a non-mission-critical piece of transportation equipment that is unsafe in inclement weather, and not usable by young people, old people, and infirm/disabled people. Any investment aimed at forcing people to use it for mission-critical transportation is a waste of public money and I totally oppose it.

Expanding buses and increasing frequency of bus service; adding bikeways; adding pavement and sidewalks where there are none.

overall cost to expand system and cost to maintain. make sure transit covers all areas of the city.

Does what you are doing actually meet these goals? Not just technically or semantically, but in spirit and concept also.

The specific number of users.

focus investment and infrastructure in communities with the highest transit-dependent populations.

Security/more driver awareness of what is going on behind the driver's section on the Max. At least some service to areas where frequent service is not required.

Age of riders. Walking distance required to access transportation. Condition of access points - i.e. are sidewalks present, mud, standing water, etc. We need more resources spent on sidewalks and walking access.

Equalizing the distance to mass transportation options.

Wise use of financial resources. Not waste money. Let people walk too.

Air pollution, population, congestion, jobs and cost.

Change out traffic signals with smart ones so you do not sit a an intersection waiting for the signal to change and no one else is around; more flashing yellow left turn signals.
In more rural suburban areas, make sure bus stops are designed for durability rather than esthetics. The hooligans always want to deface anything pretty.

Find the areas that need convenient bus service and add bus routes to cover them. The majority of lower income people who rely on public transportation and good bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are now living outside of the city center. Frequent, accessible transit should be expanded particularly in these outer regions.

Family fare structures so that it’s not so prohibitive (compared to the marginal cost of driving) for several people in a family to travel together. Express bus routes on major arterials to make it easier for new riders to identify route access and times (instead of so many routes squirreling around hither and thither through neighborhoods.) Motor vehicle use fees devoted to transit subsidies.

Transit needs to be convenient for everyone. It needs to be reliable and accessible at many hours of the day.

The future—anticipate limits on use of oil, gas.

I support this but don’t support allowing development like infill on SE Division where traffic is now so bad that the fire department won’t drive down Division when they need to respond to a fire.

The people for whom cycling is not an option!

Priority should be placed on areas/routes/travel purposes that are likely to produce the greatest shift from car to transit.

That walking is equal to all other forms and therefore, regardless of the recorded frequency of pedestrian trips, pedestrian routes should be as direct as possible and require the fewest possible crossings of the vehicle portion of the roadway. In other words, both sides of the street, continuous and direct.

Seniors. Frankly sometimes they just need a car.

Are buses more usable than MAX before making anymore rail lines.

While undoubtedly more expensive, trolley vs bus gas trolley winning every time. It’s simply more psychologically inviting. I also believe they’re ‘healthier’ & the driverless/auto tech is at our doorstep. Definitely more for tracks/rail.

Quit cutting bus service to subsidize rail. Get additional $$$. Quit doing projects cheap and resulting in embarrassingly slow transit. Light rail is slow; streetcar is a crawl. I like rail, I just want it to be better! Slow track is so ridiculous because cost cutting on construction.

Do better job to engage communities resisting transit and have a larger dialogue on transportation options— including autos; the impact of auto-dependent development should be thoroughly discussed with a goal to steer conversation toward more community-wide solutions, that would favor transit.

Reduce the number of stops to make transit a faster mode of transportation. Create BRT lanes so that buses are not stuck in the same traffic as cars making it much slower to ride. Currently, if your time is worth anything, there is little reason to use transit except being a good person.
What communities will be served, and how dollars spent will have the best impact (more frequent bus service vs better bike infrastructure).

Who and how many use each type of transport before spending the dollars.

Cost to the consumer.

No more tracks but electric is good.

Public transportation is used by lots of people but especially by elderly, those with lower incomes, disabled and students. Expand the routes where possible – part of having a really good network is having population density. So encourage people to live in the center rather than on the margins. That means affordable housing in the center. Don’t make parking easier or cheaper.

Having to transfer buses less when traveling from one part of town to another.

What are the thresholds for transit service that make it convenient enough that lots of people will use it? Is there a point at which transit comes every X minutes until Y am so it becomes the reflexive default rather than the last choice. For example, the longer waits in the evening mean I don't consider riding the bus/MAX home from most evening events.

I think the price of monthly tickets can not be considered affordable, as there is no incentive to buy it as there are no savings, except when traveling at the weekend in addition to everyday both ways to work. Meaning that I’d pay the same for a monthly pass as if single tickets for each way 5 days a week. Where I come from (Germany) public transportation is incentivized by making the monthly ticket much less, so that it is worth for me to switch to public transport instead of using my car.

We need to get fast, reliable transit to the suburbs. Gresham complained like hell when the Max went it, and now they love it. We need light rail lines to all of the suburbs, including Vancouver.

Safety and affordability. increased access and incentives to use transit rather than cars. This may come more from workplaces than transit.

Transit needs to be frequent and dependable for people to want to use it for their needs.

Future projected household and job growth. What should not be considered is cost.

Passenger and pedestrian safety. energy efficiency. positive neighborhood impacts.

I have a good working knowledge of the Tri-met transit system and have ridden many lines all over the city. The buses available on the East Side are great and I feel confident that I can get where I’m going. Recently I was trying to find a bus that would take me from W. Burnside over to Skyline and Westgate Blvd. There is no bus that goes that way with any regularity. The West Side has always had some bus service but not enough to make it efficient. I walked on Skyline Blvd. to reach my destination which was not very safe. I would have love to be able to catch a bus.

Where people actually live and where they actually need to go.
Link transit income to something other than payroll taxes, because when unemployment is high is when people need public transportation the most -- not for commuting to work, but for getting to the grocery store and the doctor, to church and civic society meetings, etc.

Keep on going as Mayor Hales has done. But, we think making people aware of the pedestrian rules and driving rules is extremely important as well. We see j-walkers all the time, even police stopping for them!!!! And then there's bicycles driving on the wrong side, against traffic, and of course, cars making left turns on red lights! These things too slow the normal flow of traffic and are illegal.

More park and rides; greater transit police presence.

Cost, if there is no money to spend millions on expanding the max lines to the farthest reaches of Portland metro and incurring more debt to do so will only increase the cost for everyone to utilize public transit in any form, then it shouldn't be considered feasible. Projects within the scope of existing budgetary constraints are great.

Our transit system is so expensive. I would think twice before taking the bus. Often cheaper to drive.

Priority should be given to projects that improve safe transportation options in communities with a high percentage of families who live in poverty. East county should be raised to the standard of transportation that the rest of the community affords.

More sidewalks in east Portland - safety for those who have no choice but to walk.

Keeping within the urban boundary and building up and not out with AFFORDABLE housing!

Expanding the transit system to include furthest reaches of east Multnoamah county and the surrounding communities; expect developers of new housing communities to plan, if not pay for, public transit on the major arteries that buyers will use to get to their new homes.

Land use planning, transportation, and finance are inextricably intertwined-Unless Metro gets serious about tying the three together, frequent, affordable transportation will be a pipe dream.

Transit is about more than just transportation - invest in places where the transit will spur more development and attract riders of choice.

Evaluating commuting vs. building business opportunities within a walkable community and then investing accordingly.

Biking and walking routes are always coupled in your questions. They are two different modes and not used by congruent populations. The very young and the old walk and those in between walk. Also, the bike routes are out among vehicular traffic and not accessible to walkers. The walking routes on on paths and sidewalks not accessible, for most urban purposes, to bikes.

Affordability is a key consideration for public transit and next is frequency on key routes at key times of day.
Creating at least one frequent transit option everywhere rather than multiple options in higher use areas. In Portland, for instance, there are places that are close in that have limited or no transit options while much farther out areas have many.

It is easy to get into the city and out of the city, but not cross town. Also evening and weekend transit is poor. A subsidy to keep the cost down is needed.

Inconvenience in the suburbs; otherwise, folks outside city center will never develop the habit of using transit. Also don't assume everyone is as fit as the image Portland likes to project; some of us can't walk quickly or more than 1/4 mile, even though we don't qualify to use the Lift service. Getting around downtown, transferring buses, and walking up hills is very difficult for some.

Transit (bus, rail, streetcar) should be frequent and available to midnight, and after mid-night on weekends. Shifting to more light rail from buses throughout the region will bring more people to use transit.

More attention should be paid to families and how transit can be made an attractive alternative to driving (not true for most families due to cost).

Right now it is far, far easier to drive a car than to ride a bus, bike, or even walk from one place to another. There is plenty of talk about prioritizing active transportation, but until budgets actually prioritize it, and until the needs of people using other modes of transportation actually take priority over those using private automobiles, it's not actually going to happen. One easy change (although difficult politically) would be to charge the market rate for automobile parking. Right now we are giving away this extremely valuable resource for free all over the place. If it was priced according to its value we might immediately be able to solve the woeful underfunding of transit.

Serving all parts of the community, with highest priority to those most dependent on public transit.

Increase streetcar options throughout the area. Decrease reliance on polluting buses. Reduce wait times on streetcars, buses, and Max to 10 minutes or LESS. Provide safety monitors on all busses and Max lines. Allow payment on Max, like is done on the streetcar. Make bus routes more straight forward and comprehensible. Look at traffic patterns and adjust bus routes accordingly. Consider having Metro take over all buses, Max, and streetcar operations -- it might be cheaper and more efficient if TriMet was eliminated and regional transit was consolidated.

Emphasis should be placed on developing self sufficient neighborhoods which have grocery stores etc. within walking distance. Hopefully, this would result in less short distance travel by car and a car would only be required for longer distance travel.

Individual communities should have input. Budget needs to be considered.

Make it part of a transportation solution. Transit should be part of the plan, not the only option.

Long-term benefits.
More/more frequent north-south connections. More/more frequent connections during the middle of the day and early
evening when seniors without other options want to do their errands and socialize. Low income areas.

make travel by low-energy means (biking, walking) simple and enjoyable.

Take a look @ San Francisco, California's muni transfer system! It works!

How to get semi-riders and non-riders on board.

Add transit routes to under served neighborhoods. Increase security on buses and trains and at stations.

Transit stops must not be too frequent or determined by commercial interest. Buses are subject to traffic conditions and are
therefore inferior to trains. Trains should run underground in the downtown area so that they can be physically longer than a
city block. Bikes and pedestrians must be kept as separate as possible and both should be kept separate from automobiles.
Share the road is at best a stop-gap policy.

Filling critical gaps in existing routes. Budget limitations - make something that works, rather than spending much more time
planning and (eventually, perhaps) money building something that's "ideal."

The most value for the money, I think, is to improve connections and access for biking and walking - connections between
neighborhoods, connections between natural areas, connections between business area and residential areas. There is an
incredible local interest in scaling communities to human modes of transportation, giving enormous aid to health and
economy. For mass transit, I think frequency is the key. If you know the system is frequent, reliable, clean and safe, then
you use it and are proud to support it with ridership and funding. Reducing frequency may seem like reducing expenditures,
but it is short sighted and just diminishes the entire system.

Include specific reference to, and consideration of, greenhouse gas emissions; provide incentives for true zero-emissions
vehicles recognize that the older population that may have difficulty walking to conventional bus stops will be increasing
emphasize flexibility.

Consider those who are low income and keep transit affordable. Develop land use and transit in tandem. Develop affordable
housing near transit. Prioritize transit investments over highway expansions.

One thing that is important is how can people get to the transit stations.. We live up on a hill  which would require climbing
on roads without sidewalks..and so we do not use the nearby transit station (MAX) unless we can be dropped off ..by car.
There is no parking there so we do not go when both of us want to go ... We love the Max and I love to use it when I have had
a long bike ride...taking my bike on the max.. but again, I cant use it to go home..w/ or w/out a bike because of the hill (Mt.
Scott).. I wish there were a short transit run to the Max station.

Consistent sidewalks in outlying areas, maintenance/debris clearing of existing & planned bike lanes.

The folks that use it the most . . . elderly, low income, ethnic groups. The cost should be reduced to make it more accessible
to these groups.
Sustainable funding sources.
Ensuring that access to facilities is equal across the city; eye for equity a/c neighborhoods. Maintain bus service where most needed. Pedestrian safety, always. Options for bus service access for the poor.
Ageing of population, funding from available sources, and citizen input.
The safely of walker/bicyclists and drivers of cars.
Focusing campaigns for this on the segments of the population under 25. Getting people to recognize the value and use it at a younger age will lay the groundwork for them to continue using it as they age, even when they could afford personal transportation.
Safety walking to/from transit locations.
How people need to travel.
While having transit anywhere is probably better than not having it, it is most helpful when it is both frequent and daily (and of course safe to access, ie: sidewalks to all stops, crosswalks at stops on busy streets or where there are no intersections). Transit routes that only serve a "9am-5pm" work day 5 days a week may reduce certain kinds of car trips at certain hours, but they will not allow people who *only* use transit to live along those routes. Routes that run seven days a week, "frequently," and as close to 24-hours as possible are most effective if you’re trying to get people to actually stop having cars.
Cost vs benefit.
Cost to benefit ratio. Meaning what specifics things will we be spending money on, and if that money is spent, who will benefit, what will those benefits be specifically, and how widespread will they be.
Link infrastructure improvements to areas that connect jobs, homes, schools, and retail.
Not everyone works in downtown Portland. Perhaps cross-town transportation could be made more direct, and therefore quicker. And even more important, increase security non all public transportation so that the public feels safe on all Tri-met transportation.
More express services. Buses and MAX are both SLOW.
The cost to consumers of the services.
Where are multiple housing units, schools, groceries and the like.
I ride transit and I think it works well. Ridership is good into downtown but other routes receive much less use. There are some obvious reasons for this. How can ridership in areas of low use be increased without having the parking and congestion levels increase to those of central districts?
Don’t focus just on downtown.
Connecting housing to employment.
Provide parking so taking mass transit is convenient. Parking in downtown Milwaukie would make it easier for more people to use light rail or bus. Make it harder for people to cheat the system by not paying for light rail. Make people feel safe traveling at night. Increase bus service to low-income communities.
Aging community, suburbs, need to unclutter highways, more frequent and comfortable service.

Not just the methods people currently use, but also whether they would switch methods if they were made more accessible. Perhaps consider looking at where people live and work and setting goals for what percentage SHOULD be biking, walking, using mass transit and then build to that.

Realistic ways of financing the costs of such investments. Develop ways to build public support for the necessary public investments.

We’re doing a good job on everything EXCEPT improving and expanding the METRO freeway system and the N Portland and I-5 bridge system.

It needs to be affordable. Government wastes money on lots of things. Maybe government subsidized mass transit (so everyone can use it) might be worth "wasting money on"?

Cost to benefit ratio.

Create more dedicated rights of way for buses on major streets and frequent lines. Develop a grid approach that expands the successful east portland grid across the region. Many of the lines servicing the suburbs still point only to the downtown hub. Hub and spoke systems don't maximize the number of reachable destinations as well in some cases.

EQUITY!!! The actual needs of the community the increase in transport investment will be benefiting.

Population density of area served and demographics of area.

For those who don't have personal transportation to get to the public transportation, walking distance should be only 2 or 3 blocks.

Consider that all people do not want to go all the way downtown to get a transfer-- consider using other town center areas instead!

Covering the whole area, not just the trendy parts of Portland.

Connecting suburban areas.

All possible financial resources.

Access for people that need it most. Affordability or subsidies so people with need can access cost effectively. Folks more on getting folks around and to neighborhoods, not just big centers.

Ease of use for elders and disabled.

Re-implement Fareless Square. Designate parking for people to use the train with it.

If it will provide frequent service. Spend more money to provide this.

The lowest income brackets. A key to helping people stay reliably employed is to make public transit very frequent, very dispersed into all neighborhoods & very affordable.

How to serve traditionally undeserved populations.
A key to this is the way that we are structuring our communities, we should try to put places to work close to people's homes instead of creating long commutes. Workplaces should be encouraged to allow workers flexibility in hours to reduce commute congestion and also give workers the option to work from home perhaps a day or two weekly.

Several roads in my neighborhood lack sidewalks. Several roads in my town lack bike lanes, forcing me to take longer routes to work or ride on the sidewalk. My wife, who is visually impaired enough to not be able to drive, has to use the bus to get around and sometimes has to wait in the rain for more than 30 minutes for a bus to come by. When new roads are built, drivers use them because they're available. I am convinced that, if more sidewalks and bike lanes are built, people WILL use them. (It's researched and proven; see "Traffic" by Tom Vanderbilt.) Getting some cars off the road reduces traffic congestion, reduces carbon emission, reduces stress... we can't lose!

Serving poor neighborhoods. Frequent service.

Keeping cars out of the core city so providing parking near transit centers. Make it easy for people visiting from outside the area to use. Learn from systems in other metro area.

Reducing our dependance on automobiles, and making other forms (walking, bicycling, mass transit, skateboarding, etc) more viable. This can mean closing roads to automobiles, and converting car parking to be used for other forms of transportation.

Transit must be dependable and not substantially increase the time to get somewhere without an intimate knowledge of the schedule - I must be able to decide to go somewhere, go to the transit stop, not have to wait a long time for the ride, and then get to the destination in a reasonable amount of time. Otherwise I'll take my car so my trip is relatively predictable and not a waste of my time.

Per person-mile cost below current private expense. Partnering with workplaces to determine business-friendly schedules (ie. both workers and patrons/customers) and rates, including discounts so employees can get lower rates. Must reduce current greenhouse gases by x% (ie. 10%/year in 3 of 5 years, with no increase in any one year).

Community resilience. Diversity and redundancy is a key principle of community resilience. A diverse (multiple modes) and redundant (multiple routes) set of transportation options is critical to ensuring mobility before and after disaster events.

Providing equal access in all neighborhoods, without gentrifying the area. A real balancing act.

Making alternative transportation affordable and convenient for low-income communities and communities of color.

Always consider light rail as base and bus as support.

Cost to lower middle and lower income families.
Special focus should be given to ease of interconnectivity of different modes of transportation such as park and ride lots and bike storage near mass transit hubs. As well as ease of connectivity across the county and to neighboring transit systems (TriMet). For example, does a driver need to drive 5 miles to a park and ride, walk 3 miles to a bus to connect to a transit mall and transfer to another bus, possibly another bus later and then to TriMet max?

Expand transit to Clark County. Consider rapid bus rather than more rail. When the rail system breaks down there are often no other options for people. STOP building the streetcar!

Incentives for electric vehicles; disincentives for ICE’s; work at national level to address mass transit and Vancouver as second-largest city in Greater Portland Metro area, given Vancouver’s mass transit planning limitations.

Future population growth areas that would include transit connections to existing connections.

Subsidies for transit should approximate non-direct payments for auto-oriented infrastructure. The belief that gas taxes (what many perceive to be a road use fee) pay for all road construction and maintenance needs to be aggressively refuted.

I support improving sidewalks and walking routes but we also need to improve access for vehicles.

Safety of those using biking routes.

Cost and how much a difference it will really make.

We have good radial connection but lack suburban to suburban connections.

Public transit is perceived poorly in the U.S., unlike other places such as Europe where it is greatly valued. Breaking that negative perception is key to the success of public transit. Show more examples of other successful public transit oriented communities. Highlight the benefits, the convenience, and the cost savings. Public safety on transit is also a barrier, a lot of people perceive the MAX and buses to be dangerous and full of crime. More security and public awareness is key.

Include all areas, not just those with the highest property values.

Areas that are served by transit and the frequency at which they run.

Which modes serve the widest subsection of people, especially people who do not use the traditional car-to-work mode.

Creating neighborhood commercial villages to eliminate food deserts and a gallon of gas for a quart of milk.
Money that has already been collected should be spent on the improvements and repairs to the roadways and sidewalks, not spent on unlimited studies and/or management personnel.

Equity first and foremost. I think frequency is a part of accessibility. If buses only run every hour, that system has very limited accessibility. Frequency of service should be just as high a priority as the diversity of routes. I would be willing to sacrifice lesser used routes (or cut back service) for more frequent (and dedicated) service for larger and longer popular routes.

Look for cost-effective solutions, improve transit reliability & speed.

Many of us live in areas that have no public transportation available within a walkable distance.

The only role of government and transportation should be to keep our road and bridges in good condition.

Look for cost-effective solutions, improve transit reliability & speed.

Many of us live in areas that have no public transportation available within a walkable distance.

The only role of government and transportation should be to keep our road and bridges in good condition.

Loss of gas tax dollars that have been funding transportation, public transit already runs at a deficit, so reducing fares will further require other means of funding to be robust.

Definitely affordable meaning stick to the practical not the irresponsible like insanely expensive bridges.

Mainly safety when walking to transit and riding on MAX.

Prioritize streetcar/max, then pedestrians, then bikes then cars.

Si.

Implementing a carbon tax and using that revenue for mass, public transit.

Faster service! Fewer stops.

Our feet and where they walk or find it difficult maybe the best place to start.

Security and poverty. Right now there is very little service in areas where low income residents live. And there is no security on the MAX.

Stabilize the funding of Metro transit so that funds are available in periods of recession when more transit is needed.
Comparable access across regions efficient use of limited funds fairness among all modes of transit.

End the foolishly expensive and graft-ridden 'Light' Rail expansion, and replace it with flexible Express Bus Transit. Curitiba Brazil built their EBT system for 7/10 of one per cent of the estimated light rail cost, and LA and Eugene have found it useful. It can be made environmentally superior by the use of Natural Gas Hybrids or electric propulsion with recharging at stops, without the use of caternaries.

Cost, convenience, feasibility, environment.

Equity of transportation options in every neighborhood.

Job and school locations, families, cost.

More funds in areas where residents have demonstrated consistent public transport use.

Buses need a method of picking up people without placing the most inconvenience upon cyclists in restricted lanes. Often cars are able to pass by safely and without hindrance, but cyclists are forced to wait. Much of cycling as an efficient transportation mode relies upon inertia and remaining in motion. I ask that bus stops be designed so as to treat cycles near the buses in an equal fashion as cars and trucks near it.

Real versus theoretical usability of transit mode - e.g. I live within one mile of a MAX Blue line stop, but must drive more than two miles in the wrong direction in order to use Park and Ride to get downtown.

Public transportation should affordable to most.

Support employers who provide good jobs.

Public preferences and wisely budgeting funds.

The true usability that the transit system can support travel needs.

Frequent service is key to encouraging more drivers to switch to transit.

Getting the most bang for our buck to keep fares affordable. Cutting wasteful stops that are ridiculously close to the next stop. Connecting outlying areas. Keeping the community involved.
Getting the most bang for our buck to keep fares affordable. Cutting wasteful stops that are ridiculously close to the next stop. Connecting outlying areas. Keeping the community involved.

The design of bus stations should take into consideration older people who need to sit while waiting. New station do not have enough covered seating.

Money. Money.

Transit must be planned to direct people to mini-town centers. People need to find all or most of their needs when using transit. Otherwise no one uses it.

Growing population of elderly.

Tri-Met does not do its job. The recent State of Oregon audit of Tri-Met was too broad and brief. Yet it found severe management lapses and incompetence. Tri-Met’s existing bus system/routes do provide adequate service to Metro area residents. e.g. on the west side (Washington County) there are no dedicated city/unincorporated urban area transit routes dedicated to serve that community. It appears that every route is connected to serving routes to downtown Portland via MAX or direct/indirect bus routes. Its time for Tri-Met to have a top down revamping of who and what it is. Its time to split up Tri-Met: -they can have the MAX system (it is under engineered; systems are failing and have to be rebuilt; it cannot operate in all weathers). -Let the individual counties (Multmonah, Clackamas, Washington) run the bus systems.

The fact that most people drive and will continue to drive. Transit should be busses. Light rail and the street car have hurt our financial situation as a city.

More buses, less rail.

Equity. Invest in the most undeserved areas of the region, outer east Portland and make your engagement culturally responsive, you’re not doing it this way.

Make transit affordable and frequent the those who are dependent on it and who are low-income.

Exclusive physically separated right-of-way is needed for many transit lines, especially in the most densely populated areas, otherwise transit becomes mired in single-occupancy private motor vehicle traffic - in essence, providing no incentive to ride transit when congestion is highest.

Bikeways that feel safe enough for women, children and the elderly.

Making our community pedestrian friendly.

For those who currently *drive cars*: Make it more convenient, accessible, and ATTRACTION (appealing). I believe this is of paramount importance, as density and population (and traffic congestion) in our region continue to grow.
Urge Neil McFarlane, 503 962-4831, TriMet Gen Mngr to apply the Smith System in bus operator training. Today operators
drive like everyone else who don’t think about moving the bus so passengers get the most comfortable ride. Experience
operators DRIVING to red traffic signals in downtown trans mall. Look. Bus shelters are every four-blocks. They travel faster
than the speed of light and thus STOP OR SLOW at every light. What an enormous waste of taxpayer $$$$. Importantly
overdriving the light costs oxygen-fuel-tires-brakes-pavement. Consuming all this creates toxic gasses and guck going down
storm drain. Salmon silently sip dinosaur soup as operators mindlessly drive 40,000 pound bus like a sports car. I’ve
commented to TMet for years about this and other wasteful behaviors and action. No change. 1. Observe that many bus
license plates have GILLIG rectangles. I phoned Tmet asked “Who is GILLIG?” Receptionist gleefully stated “They make our
busses.” Then I phed TMet records. “How long has bus #1609 been in service and how many miles has it travelled?” Ten
years. 448,000 miles. I had maintenance remove the metal rectangles so weathered that paint had faded. THE ADVERTISING
WEIGHED A POUND!!!!!!! Over ten-years it had traveled to the moon and back with a POUND OF BUS MANUFACTURER
More routes available to more people. Keep the rates low enough for everyone and keep it SAFE! Cameras and Security!!!

Integrating bus and train services.
Keeping fares as low as possible.
Convenient should top the list. If transit is wildly more time-consuming than driving, it won’t be considered.
Where are the largest number of transit users?
Wheelchair accessibility.
Impact on traffic. Don’t duplicate routes between rapid transit and buses, in terms of stops. Current MAX makes too many
stops downtown.
Focus on areas of hugest volume usage and heaviest traffic. Solutions must be made to be more appealing(time wise) than
using a car.
It’s site dependent. Some places need higher frequency. Others need convenience.
In addition to connectivity to walking and biking routes (very important) include connectivity to parking (park & ride) and
other transit systems.
Less max and light rail focus on Bus Rapid Transit.
The size and make-up of the community, existing transportation options.
Frequency of service.
Anything to reduce cars etc on the road.
Lower rates, frequent service.
Making it physically and financially accessible.
Safe lighting, no smoking under kiosks, lighting.
The details: inclusive, community-based planning process (demographically, and geographically), overall timeframe and timeframe for each project, balanced budget for each project, active participation and buy off from cities and towns within the Trimet service area and from supporters and doubters of various transportation modalities, especially transportation and infrastructure needed for bicycle transportation.

You would have to do a survey of riders income status how often they ride. How many ride for work, school or other reasons.

Currently there is not enough parking at our local max station (sunset). My husband is able to take a bus and then the max downtown to work, but if we want to use the max as a family, we don't want to take our young son on the bus. On more than one occasion the sunset parking garage has been full. If my husband tries to drive to Sunset instead of taking the bus, unless he arrives prior to 7 am, the parking garage is full and he has to waste time coming home and finding alternative transportation to the max station.

Also, require TriMet to provide garbage collection at bus stops so they’re not so discouraging to potential riders. (Disclosure: there’s a bunch of litter on my property thanks to the bus stop ;)

Equity of access to transportation to all areas of Portland. Use of funds wisely to choose long lasting solutions that can grow as Portland does as a city. Reduced fares are great and important.

Equity, r.o.l.

Long term goals.

The ability to easily get to any place in the network without needing to spend time looking up timetables and routes and scheduling your trip around them.

Safety/cleanliness of walking routes, more frequent service on certain routes during off-peak commuter hours.

Cost to lower middle and low income families.

Instead of digging up the streets to add rails and install messy overhead wires; keep Portland moving forward by scrapping the 19th century streetcar plan, then replace it with a less costly, new technology, environmentally friendly 21st century electric bus plan. Include bus pullouts at transit stops so other traffic is not obstructed when boarding passengers. Traffic congestion associated with buses stopping in motor vehicle travel lanes is counter productive to reducing fuel consumption and emissions. Transportation policy must also include a financially self-sustainable goal for transit.

Integration of all transportation sources in a rational and not expensive way to property owners alone.

How to drastically reduce CO2 emissions: how to get people out of their cars; how do we get to a fossil free way of living; and help those amongst us who are least able to get around.

Environmental impact and flexibility.

This will benefit the most people; including those that may not have the opportunity to take advantage of the other policies.
Safety! Major stops need to be patrolled by police to make sure people are safe when using the Max. I do not use the Max because it is not safe and trying to buy a ticket is difficult. Sometimes the machines are not working.

Equity.

Emphasize bus, with low capital expenditures vs. light rail, with high capital expenditures.

Increased service to areas of lower economic prosperity; increased service concentrated during commuter hours; increased convenience from NE PDX to airport.

Raise fares, not taxes or fees.

It will make sense to consider the following: public transportation more accessible, affordable and make it a priority for people to start thinking about driving less. After all we got this one planet and we might as well take better care of it.

Weekend and evening transit. I live in Tualatin and there is not much on weekends or evenings. I am always driving to events in Portland.

One of the problems I see with the current policy of increasing the number of bike lanes in Portland is that it is more and more difficult for automobiles and public transit vehicles to maneuver. I live in SE Portland, and my neighborhood has become less safe for pedestrians and drivers. Clinton Street is a dedicated bicycle street, with center plantings every few blocks to slow traffic, plus new bioswales under construction. Two blocks away SE Division Street is becoming virtually unmaneuverable because of construction/development, so many cars are opting to travel on Clinton Street between SE 17th & Cesar Chavez. Bicycles continue to use Division as well. Plus there has been the addition of many new residents in the neighborhood without any provision for parking their cars so Division, Clinton and side streets are glutted with parked vehicles turning nearly every side street into a one-lane road. Because of the parking problems, bicycles and traffic glut, Tri Met buses often travel in the middle of both streets, effectively tying up traffic going in both directions. This particularly true on SE Clinton between SE 20th and SE 26th. We need this bus!! But it's a tricky driving situation. My husband and I are senior citizens with infirmities that come with age. Bicycles were once a part of our lives, but a spinal surgery prevents me

Existing population centers (like suburbs) and helping them work by accommodating materials/product transit and flexible commuter travel modes. Serve the majority not small but outspoken special interest groups. Consider also social costs in displacement and use of financial resources.

Not only students and low income people ride transit. Improve the image to get diversified ridership. Also, make transit safe and rider-friendly by having safety patrols (v. power hungry fare inspectors and drug patrolling german shepherds...), reminding people to keep noise down or clear the aisles. I have previously suggested quiet zones or quiet cars.

Safety and convience.

Park and Ride and more bike lockers.
Focus more on getting people within a 1 mile radius of MAX to the station (transit connects, bike lockers, safe walking access).

Anything that makes cycling and walking safer is a win. I ride with my boys to their school in North Portland on some days and there aren't any great bike routes so we have to ride on the sidewalk for some stretches. I would love to see more bike-friendly options!

Costs associated with externalities not currently quantified (climate change)—what happens if we do not make these changes? Cost-benefit relationship changes drastically if these are appropriately quantified.

Incorporating all modes of transportation in the model, and taking into account that some people who might be potential cyclists need more safety incorporated in areas where cyclists intermix with cars and pedestrians.

Ridiculous question—what are the tradeoffs????? Obviously politicians don't have a bottomless pot of money to work with. Might as well ask if I like chocolate.

Users should pay for support of facilities; bikers pay a tax on bikes/biking clothes; walkers pay a tax on walking shoes, etc. Drivers pay a tax on cars, trucks.

Safe bike/walk ways where traffic is visible for people coming both ways.

Increasing public transit is an equity issue. Public Transit is the most environmental and socially just transportation option for our families and communities. Making public transit affordable or free and increasing frequency and accessibility is the best possible transit investment in our city. There is no reason why we can't make public transit a more affordable more efficient means of transportation that individual vehicles.

More light on the road with bike path.

Getting people out of their cars, either to commute or to recreate.

Yes I support more investment for these improvements but don't do it through increased property taxes.

Engage with those who have the fewest options for alternative transportation.

Increased bike paths that can get you off the road. Include outreach and education about bike safety and rules. Programs to reduce bike theft. This is a huge problem our family alone has had six bicycles stolen in the last four years. If you don't have a bike you have to get in a car or other mode of transportation.

Covered bus shelters with seating; lights for riders to activate when their bus approaches for non-downtown stops. Open up dead ends, at least for bikes and pedestrians, so they can get through suburban neighborhoods. Educate drivers to stop for pedestrians at intersections, including T-shaped intersections w/o crosswalks. Create more protected bike lanes, especially in Washington Cty, Beaverton, and Tigard.

SAFETY - esp. concerning bicycles. The city should not be negligent just because they are immune from lawsuits for poor design (ie streetcar tracks and bicycle lanes).
If we want to reduce car trips for families we need to lift the rules against cargo bikes on the Max and possibly facilitate cargo bike on the bus.

Restoring fairness square, as well as making service more frequent.


There should be focus on easier access for people to reach places of employment and education.

Expanding service to the suburbs of Portland, particularly the east side. East-west routes & north-south routes east of 82nd Ave. More sidewalks are needed in east Portland. Sidewalks need to be built in the Central Eastside Industrial District, too. Put bike routes on quieter residential streets & not neighborhood collectors or main arterial streets where they conflict with vehicles more. It's a bad policy to place bike routes on streets traveled heavily by motorized vehicles. It's crowding too many transportation modes in one place otherwise. Yes, I would like to see transit fares reduced at least 1/2 ($50/month for AZ pass) from the current price ($100/month for AZ pass).

Priority should go to under served, marginalized communities, e.g., East Portland.

Reducing bus/MAX fares.

Need to consider that buses are cheaper and more versatile.

Users, accessibility, human-powered transport.

Make TriMet more accountable the community. Buses are crowded (why can't PPS bus its students) and dirty, and these conditions alienate riders. Stopping the construction of apartments and condos that lack condos. Identify all areas in the city where traffic bottlenecks.

Neighborhood input on a case by case basis required.

How to best be of service to the person who does not have a vehicle. How to best serve people who must commute to a job in a location where there is no parking available, or where it is price prohibitive. How to keep mass transit affordable.

Bus rapid transit. Currently, our bus system works great. I can get to downtown faster by bus that any other way. However, some problems include over crowding, and not enough service at peak times.

Implement high capacity, high quality transit like bus rapid transit or light rail, and encourage development around transit stations so that people can get their shopping, entertainment, living, and employment done conveniently without the need for a car.

Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 1:

1. The primary mode of transportation is automobile, this needs to be the priority. Maintenance and improvement of the roads should be at the top of the list.
2. ROI - never occurs with MAX compared to buses. Even buses are too heavily subsidized.
Build roads so the cars do not idle so long in traffic.

Build more roads.

Bicycle riders often do not follow the rules of the road, and are not required to pay anything for the right to use streets. Automobile drivers must buy licenses, registrations, insurance, and pay tax of gasoline. Let bike riders pay for their own place to ride.

Alternatives to make auto traffic flow faster thus reduce emissions, cost to consumers.

TriMet spends too much on expensive MAX trains, often pushing them into communities that don't want them. Buses are much cheaper, more flexible, and easier on the local environment.

Fewer trains, better roads.

the cost to tax payers and the bad economy.

Use the money you all ready have wisely, no big retirements and salaries and benefits. Show us it's about transit and not about increasing the employees take.

type of transit, investment of initial capital and then infrastructure maintenance, where would it go.

FIRST! Fix the roads that we have. That means NO NEW CONSTRUCTION with current road funds. New construction ONLY with a VOTE FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS for NEW FUNDS!

How hard it is driving around metro. Need to be able to get to and from downtown and across town faster.

Transportation should be self-supporting, not subsidized from the general fund. This applies to roads as well.

We have already invested heavily in Transit projects. We need to invest in our surface system capacity.

Current policy is adequate.

Need to consider HOW people need to move. Mass transit should not take precedence over auto.

I am amazed how many decisions and actions that state this intent actually do the reverse in implementation.

Money prioritization, and liberty.

The huge debt will drown future generations. One only has to look at TRI-MET to see the incompetence and waste this organization has brought us.

Do not force it on the people as it presently is.

Tri-met miss manages their $$. Their investment in Light Rail continues to reduce the operating capital available for the bus network which could go every instead of point A to B only. Metro talks about increased Transit Service while Trimet reduces it.

Cost.

Whether the cost savings are worth the financial investment.

If the voters say no to light rail do not screw us and build it anyway. milwaukie said no clackamas said no yet tri met said screw you. 150 million dollars a mile a waste of money.

Local areas should vote.

Will greenhouse gases really be reduced or will we just hope?
Spending.

Whether rural areas even want transit. Don't build it in rural areas if it's not wholeheartedly requested.

Amount of use. When a bus route picks up 2 or 3 people in a day, it's not fair to have the community as a whole support the costs. How about a small van? Have service 2 or 3 times a day from Sandy area to Gresham and back.

This policy should not be implemented.

Public transit does not operate in my local community. I do not want to pay for that which does not benefit my local community.

It will never happen. Transit fees go up and up and up, discouraging most people from using it regularly. If it were cheaper, we would ride much more often. And bus routes keep getting cut, keeping even more people from being able to use it.

Stop taking the highway away from our cars by eliminating lanes dedicated to bikes. Many of us must travel by car and the congestion created by having to sit in line because of a created shortage of highway lanes only adds to pollution.

Bike owners should have to register their bikes, which should include a fee.

The real costs and how our small communities are not able to cover their portion. These transit projects are pushed on these communities without thought of what they need, want or can afford. I've seen the deterioration of neighborhoods directly impacted by new transit.

I am for better mass transit but I don't agree that we will see all the benefits you have listed. In fact, I think you overlook some basic needs of those of us who actually work and pay the taxes.

What will it cost the tax payer?

The long history of incompetent management at Tri-Met.

Buses are fine because they can go where the riders are. Relatively speaking they are cost-efficient and flexible to meet changing needs. Light rail is a bad idea because riders must figure out how to get where it is. It is clear that light rail can never come close to supporting even its operating costs. If we must have mass transit, let it be buses.

We do not need additional public investment. Instead, we need reduced government rules that prohibit private enterprise from addressing this need. For example, services like Uber should welcomed into communities to enhance transportation options. Instead, governments seem intent to regulate these services so much that they cannot operate.

Overall, transit is already convenient, frequent and accessible. Projects like those proposed make living here more and more unaffordable.
I'm all for a robust transit system so long as we don't squander more money on rail. Buses can go where the people who want to ride them are. Rail requires that riders come to it. This is a fool's proposition given the alternative of buses. Regional "experts" just don't seem to get it.

Under 3% of our community ride their bikes and it is mostly for recreation. Ours is a rainy community and we like our cars. Bus service has been trimmed back so expanded bus routes and frequency would help.

Do not increase investment, the current level is acceptable.

More lanes for cars and higher speed limits.

If the goal is reduced fossil fuel use, mass transit won't have much effect since relatively few trips a household makes can be done with fixed route mass transit.

Use, costs, diverting funding that could be better used for over crowded roads.

Need to include autos as well.

Transit use versus Cars. Cars are most convenient, accessible and affordable. Trains are extremely expensive, especially to taxpayers. Buses are less convenient and frequent. Bikes are all three but not everyone can ride them. Safety is also a factor.

Portland has already over-invested in public transit. It's time to focus on other priorities for a while.

I live in Clackamas county and the residents and voters of our county NEVER wanted Tri MET to expand its light rail into Oak Grove/Milwaukie area and force incurred costs of that light rail onto the shoulders of our citizens here! The fact that back room deals were made and Cost's incurred and the project still going forward is Unacceptable and deplorable to me especially as someone who lives out in Rural Colton where DEQ and Tri MET expenses should not apply!

For some of us who live on the outer areas of Metro, getting to and taking public transportation is a 3 hr ordeal (ONE_WAY!), unless you miss a scheduled connection and then it's even MORE! Driving my own vehicle is 45 minute by comparison! This plan is primarily directed to manage the current transit efforts when many of us need better parking downtown. Parking structures are not evenly located around town, a 6-block (longways) in the heat of summer and cold/wet of winter isn't fun. To reduce impact of large pickups and other gas guzzlers, you might consider a parking premium for these vehicles or a price break for electrics, hybrids, and other future fuel efficient vehicles.

The people that provide jobs drive to work and run small businesses. We are the ones paying for mass transit.

Taxpayers should be asked if they WANT and would USE the system. too often it seems like MAX is being installed in communities for Portland's sake, even though residents of other cities where they are being installed do not want nor would use this. Stupid waste of money.

You can use smaller buses and stop all this light rail. The amount of money blown on light rail would have accomplished all of your ideas above.

If transit systems are a must then transit riders should pay the entire cost of the system.
Shouldn’t this question be, should we implement this policy? It seems biased towards a support position. How about you expand roads instead of mass transit and help the poor get a car? That would empower them far more than $1 billion more on mass transit.

Have to first ensure that adequate investment is made on our roads and highways, to ensure congestion does not strangle; investment, job creation, and economic expansion. We are at the place where the engine that also creates taxes and revenues will stop, thru the failure to invest with adequate roads and highways. You are killing the chicken that lays the golden egg, by not understanding what comes first.

Listen to voters. We said no to trimet and they did whatever... Stupid.

Expand transit when there is demand, when the existing system is approaching capacity.

Cost effectiveness and if it is self sustainable!

No more light rail; too expensive. Increased bus service is fine. No reduced fares; riders don't pay a fair share already, and/or Metro spends money frivolously.

This is a money and power grab, based on lies and bogus science. CO2 rises after temperature, not before. There is a saturation point where CO2 no longer affects temperature. The controlling greenhouse gas is water vapor.

Funds should come from user fees and bikers should be fined for riding on the road when a bike path is available to ride on.

I think it’s wishful thinking that the priority for active transportation should be the norm rather than the exception.

Make it safe if that is possible. You take your life in your hands to get on MAX, especially at night. At this point, never would I let my wife take it alone.

The people’s choice and safety not only for when on transit, but for communities. MAX has increased crime and decreased property values.

Taxes!

Give priority to increase road capacity to match the population increase.

Cost to make transit actually convenient, frequent and affordable are outrageous. Currently tri-met only serves Portland well. The remaining cities in the region are mostly left out. We need roads to drive on. This is cheaper. Cars are more fuel efficient now and have much lower emissions.

Light rail has ghastly cost/benefit. STOP all light rail and HRT plans. More buses might be added, but improving roadway capacity should be first priority -- pavement 'works' 24/7, and most cars & trucks move without 'us' (the public) having to pay a driver plus their ridiculous pension & benefits.
The communities of King City, Tigard and Tualatin all voted against having light rail in our communities. I think it is arrogant that Metro and some of the mayors are still going ahead as if the citizens vote didn't happen. We don't want it, we do not aspire to be like Portland. Lastly, I suggest you do a study of the crime light rail brings to the communities. The Tualatin mayor will not get my vote this election because he still advocates light rail even though the light rail initiative was overwhelmingly rejected 75%-25%.

Make the roads better and safer.

It seems like we throw money at these transit projects and we don't improve much participation.

Make it easier for cars and light trucks to get around town before spending any more on transit. Too much time sitting in traffic jams causes a lot more pollution.

The amount of subsidy required by tax payers.

Public transit doesn't go where I want to go - or takes hours to get there. I definitely will not use public transit at night when the thugs and gang member look a-likes are present.

Reduce congestion on roads and freeways by investing specifically by adding lanes and planning the southern crescent connectors.

By far, most in our area travel by car. Need to make roads more accessible to car and light truck traffic. Current policy seems to be focused on making our primary mode of travel more difficult and time consuming, thereby increasing pollution and energy consumption.

Where is money currently being spent. Make sure you are spending money correctly before you come and ask for more. How much money was wasted studying the CRC before nothing happened? How man millions of dollars?

It seems that adding to the transit system doesn't get people off the roads. Traffic just gets worse.

Tri Met has a bloated budget & spiraling toward bankruptcy; fix the pensions and payscales before expanding & using more transportation dollars with mass transit.

Improve the highway system first before dealing with transit system.

Need. Not just want.

I support the access, creation, retention of jobs. I don't support alternative transportation options.

We need a west side (I-605) freeway built, this should be at the top of the list for transportation.

Current ridership fare collection.

Better bus service in outer areas. Less Portland-centric. Spend more on neighborhood streets and less on major streets. We need to get people out of cars.
Provide alternatives for freight. Heavy freight is responsible for a large portion of road maintenance, congestion and pollution. Increase taxes on these types of transportation to encourage a smaller carbon offset. Pursue and invest in “Locally Sourced” that will encourage jobs, stimulates development provide consumers with noncongested roads, reduce air pollution and reduce the risk of accidents. Provide safe, efficient and affordable alternatives as well as bike and pedestrian trails.

We have no money for this. Taxpayers and Businesses are over-taxed already. Have you really looked at how there is no real economic recovery to the middle-class?

If mass transit were safer, I would support spending money for it. We don't need more or bigger roads. Encourage telecommuting instead.

Our transit system is not convenient because it takes too long to get from place to place. In suburban areas the schedules are too infrequent.

The majority of people use vehicles. Roads and easing traffic congestion should be the first priority.

Our government has lost its mind. Portland has never been out of the 10 worst cities for traffic in the last decade. Yet our morons in charge remove half of the lanes on major through ways.

Stop taking away roads. Portland consistently ranks as one of the worst cities to drive in the US.

Stop wasting our money on things that the vast majority of us do not use. Look at road use by cars vs bikes. Look at road use by cars vs mass transportation. It's clear that most people would rather drive. Wasting money on a mass transportation system is silly and only continues to lose money.

The impact for people who have no desire to use mass transit and the disruption of everyday activities during the construction mess. Be realistic, put yourselves in the impacted people seat and quit trying to shove it down everyone's throat.

How to make it easier for motorized vehicles to get around. If biking and walking can be done in a way that will not inhibit vehicular traffic then I'm all for it.

It work in the city where people see the congestion, but when you expnd out to the suburbs, people are more used to autonomy, and very few use mass transit. Why waste the dollars?

We need to spend our transportation dollars to improve and add ROADS. In the last few years it seems most of the dollars have been spent on light rail and bike lanes. We need more and better maintained roads - for cars and trucks.

The Light rail ridership is so low, I don't know how you can justify more.

Stop using the gas taxes for bikes etc. gas taxes should pay for roads only!!!!

Cost and public participation levels.

Don't.

The cost to the taxpayer of your "investments".

Cars should take precedence. Build more roads.
Existing public transit system is sufficient. Continue current funding. Do not add any more light rail.

Efficiency for routes so as to minimize gas consumption by stopping too often.

Transit doesn't pay for itself. It's expensive to build and expensive to operate. The fares collected don't cover anything.

Transit should be able to support itself, it used to when private companies ran it.

You need to be careful deciding areas to invest more in mass transit. Light rail very expensive and permanently tied to location of tracks. Busses much more flexible with changing communities. Be extremely mindful of increasing crime in some areas through mass transit & bike paths. Be extremely mindful of private property rights. Stop trying to reach out & implement mass transit in rural areas.

I do not want to be on a bus or train with people that might harm me, so I will drive! It is no longer safe!

"Transit service" in the Metro area almost exclusively refers to the current "chic" topic - light rail. Light rail is too expensive and way too inflexible. Buses, on the other hand, can change routes easily as communities and needs change. Develop bus options, avoid additional, extremely expensive light rail. Mass transit must be self-sustaining and paid for by users.

I guess my experiences with the transit system don't seem much need for improvement in this area compared to other areas. I can see how more transit connection locations could be useful here or there or reduced fares for those who need it. As far as bike/walking routes that connect stops I don't understand exactly how those will be implemented or what the purpose is...doesn't the transit service connect the stops for you with the transportation?

Before expanding or increasing frequency of transit, we need to first reduce the fares to get more users.

The mass transit agency has shown itself to be a poor manager of the public's money. Reliance on and spending for the grossly expensive light rail system has gutted more effective bus transit options. Light rail is nothing more than a glorified photo op for Tri-Met leaders and their willing government partners. Until this leadership is radically changed in both Tri-Met and local/state governments additional funding would only reward irresponsible behavior.

First, make sure that the existing infrastructure can be maintained before building anything new.

More buses and bus routes. No more light rail.

I would support this if we had good strategic planning in place that assured the transit system would be used to its fullest. Right now, it is not convenient and the population distribution does not support mass transit affordability.

Too many resources have been wasted on Transit as it is.

Not spending taxpayer dollars on it. Let the transit system be covered by the fares of those who use it.

Our region focuses too much attention on capital construction costs for expanding public transit service without understanding (caring about?) how to operate and maintain the system.
Better allocation of existing funds; no more WES boondoggles.

We need to invest in the 205 beltway (west side bypass) and third bridge for our economic sustainable future before we pay for any more bike lanes, walkways, or mass transit. See Port of Portland study.

It does seem that we are doing pretty good in having enough areas covered by bus or train service. I do think there should be more work done on to make sure that the bus service is on time! especially in the evenings as workers just want to get home instead of waiting and then spending time on a bus or train when one knows that a private car would get them there faster.

No more money from the community. Less expensive less "first world" options need to be implemented.

Walking, and biking and public transit are really separate issues.

We have spent too much as a community on mass transit, street cars that move at a snail's pace, and bike lanes on congested roads.

If you reduce fares someone will pay for it, please do not increase taxes. Fill the pot holes. Use the taxes already collected to maintain roads. Do not pass the street tax. Add buses, stop spending on streetcars and MAX.

Reduce investment in bike lanes, trollies, trains and increase/improve roads for cars.

We need to catch up our other transportation infrastructure first, like consider the deferred maintenance on roads and bridges.

That most people don't use transit so there's no benefit to the majority if the population.

Frequently on narrow streets like Hawthorne and Division, the bus takes both driving lanes and causes long lines of cars to build up behind. Sometimes, impatient drivers make dangerous moves and cut across the double yellow line into head on traffic to get around the bus. In addition, buses cause major damage to our roads. MAX allows criminals to move around town and increases crime rates in every new neighborhood it moves into. I'm not in favor of making further investments in tri-met. cycling and walking are the future of travel.

I do not see it being addressed that there is no service late at night, and safety involved with that as well.

No more investment. I support cutting benefits for trimet employees and reducing the number of stops on existing lines.

I had trouble answering the last question because I am, in fact, in favor of making transit convenient, frequent, accessible, and affordable, but I answered "no" because I do not believe in the expansion of the max and streetcar system due to the extremely high cost of such (we should be focusing solely on less expensive and more adaptable buses), and I strongly disagree with some of the expansion of bike lanes. I love the idea of more off-street bike paths, or bike paths separated by a set of car park spaces (like near PSU), but I think it's absolutely nutty to have the city take busy city streets and remove a full lane of vehicular traffic to install a bike lane as was done on NW Everett. This is absolutely stupid!
Steps should be taken to decrease our reliance on private vehicles, and to discourage people from driving, especially for short, neighborhood trips. However, the cost of transit is high, and the return on investment (that is, increase in ridership) is low. I believe transit investments are better spent increasing accessibility to existing facilities, and working on the "last mile" issue.

WHY are all these questions so damned slanted? Why not have 2 radios that both say "Yes?" This is ridiculous. You have HORRIBLE poll makers, or ones that are so biased they can't see past their own beliefs.

This should not be considered.
Cost without a love affair with trains.
The reason I didn't answer "yes" is because I didn't want my answer to be an endorsement for lihjtrail, bike paths, etc. I do support investing in roads for automobiles and trucks.
Economic sense by government.
Not using taxes to pay for this.
Repair current infrastructure and quit spending money not allocated.
Remember we do have a large number of younger seniors that drive and walking to transportation while ill is not realistic or is the lack of parking.
We have for far too long now placed all emphasis on transportation improvements in Portland on Transit. Notably light rail and streetcar. It is time to build and maintain roads instead.
Transit DOES NOT save energy, thus DOES NOT reduce CO2 Transit costs 2-10 times the cost of driving Transit takes, on average, about twice as long to get to work. What is the reason for getting people out of cars top transit? - It costs more, is slower and does not save energy references: http://www.debunkingportland.com/top10bus.html http://www.debunkingportland.com/lrt_cost_w_localmatch.html http://www.debunkingportland.com/commutetime.html
Transit uses more energy than small cars Transit costs 3-5 times the cost of cars Transit wastes people's time with an average commute to work time of about double that of car users.
Transit needs to be more financially self-sustainable with users paying a greater share of the costs both for infrastructure and operations.
Since transit fares cover only 25% of the operating costs, the taxpayer funded subsidies for transit ridership are way too high, much less than for cars where drivers pay their way with fuel taxes and license fees. Investments in transit need to be paid by those who ride transit. Changes do however need to be made such as to removing bubble curbs and constructing bus turnouts to reduce the traffic congestion buses create at transit stops.
How to do a better job with the existing funds (or, better yet, do a better job with less (subsidizing by taxpayers)). From what I've seen, it seems like more money is being spent on administration/bureaucracy than the actually running of the buses and trains.

Transit should be all modes of transportation including autos and trucks. We are so keen on bikes we often forget safe routes for all.

I don't support more of what is being done. You need to keep the roads also not replace lanes for cars with bike lanes. You should consider fire truck turning needs getting ambulances places to save lives. I have already noticed what is happening to that... They can't get through. And we haven't yet tripled in population.

Bus max and bike lanes are among the best in the nation. significant additional expense has little value added. effort should be towards more bang for the buck.

We have got to stop adding bike lanes to main arterial(s) such as Burnside, Glisan, Powell, etc. They should be limited to vehicular traffic only. In fact, bikes should be prohibited on certain arterials within the city to ensure cars are backed-up spewing more pollutants than is necessary into the air.

This is not a yes or no answer...oversimplified!!! It is hard to support "more investment" when I have concerns that the current system isn't working as well as it should WITH THE EXISTING RESOURCES.

Discontinue Tunnel vision.

Billions of $ have been spent on light rail in the metro area. A very small % of people use it, it attracts crime on it and around it. Unless the service provided can vastly improve I don't see sinking billions more into the system.

No one seems to be consider the adverse conditions that are being created by doing what we have done thus far to the infrastructure to do these things. Just so you know I used to bike a lot more than I do now. I did it when there were no bike paths and you could get a ticket for jay walking. It was fine then. Bikers these days do things I would never do on a bike. They need to have biking classes sort of like drivers do. I have almost been hit multiple times by bikes as a pedestrian!!!! They need to be forced to learn the rules of the road. I find it outrageous that "they" are seen as green "saints" and they endanger people's lives. Drivers learn the rules of the road by getting licensed. Bikers and I am one need to be licensed also. The adverse conditions that are being created thus far are things like: fire trucks emergency vehicles are being slowed down endangering peoples lives, Because there are so many roads now that used to be two lanes cars are actually sitting in traffic for longer and guess what that means? We are polluting our environment by policy! The other ridiculous thing is the no left turn. I have actually driven over a mile to get to one block. This needs to be balanced with the idea that we will still have cars. The other thing I think needs to be considered is how much money we are spending for bike lanes and roads

Only add more public transit when there is the demand and not before there is demand.

Fixing Roads for CARS TRUCKS and COMMERCE.

Only invest in better bus service. No more light rail.
Over reliance on light rail; when light rail goes in, time and again, outer-lying bus service is cut, using a hub-based transportation model. This results in longer, and less efficient, commutes.

Remember that most people use their cars.

It should not be implemented.

The minuscule % of the population that uses transit relative to the % that drive cars. Our gas tax money is best spent to help the most people: those who commute by car.

I've said 'no' but really want to say 'maybe'. Depends on the goals. We can't use public transport to the airport since we cannot connect to taxis for the last leg of our journey to home. These problems need addressing to enlarge use of the light rail system. Journey times is real impediment to bus public transport. Too often travel time is long. This policy should emphasize private ownership of mass transit to improve efficiency. With private ownership, if the enterprise falls short of performance, then switch to another service provider.

The fact that I live in SW and we have been trying to get a sidewalk to serve Maplewood district to 45th and Vermont to no avail. Maplewood bus schedules have been cut so much that they no longer serve the community.

Expanding the transit system - to you - is to expand MAX again, and again and again. I have had enough of MAX, the high price, low ridership and how much they destroy the natural beauty around them when they build. We have enough bike lanes. People still bike on the sidewalk and makes it difficult for pedestrians anyway. But, you don't care and this is all for naught anyway - isn't it?

Actually, I do support it, but only after all streets are adequately paved and there are sidewalks throughout Portland.

Real-world solutions, vis a vis targeting best value per mile propositions (hint: It isn't rail).

Give the public info on the trade-off that occurs when limited funds are spent on transit, biking, etc. compared to street maintenance.

Transit is too slow, not always too infrequent or uncomfortable, just plain slow. Fix that which you don't address at all.

We spend too much on rail.

It's already convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable. I would add that building unneeded/unwanted "ghost trains" to nowhere is not the answer. Per mile cost, rail is the most expensive form of transport we have, in the long term and short term, and not a sustainable solution.

Not until all streets are paved!

Need better sidewalks, roads and bike lanes. Getting more folks out and about will help community policing by osmosis.

Forget the inking routes. Serves too few people.
Demonstration that TRIMET can actually manage the resources they currently have. There is considerable doubt at this time!

I think that Portland has done a good job in making transit convenient, frequent, accessible if anything is done it might be making it more affordable for people on fixed incomes such as seniors like myself!

I would only support this if I can be assured that my property taxes aren't going to go up to finance it. It seems like home owners always are the ones having to finance everything... users should pay their fare share, be they renters or home owners.

I am disabled. I will not use public transportation because I do not feel that it is safe.

Cost, economic impacts, jobs.

There should be a button that says maybe. I don't support all the positions mentioned which is why I could not say a definitive yes.

We're already spending too much on ridiculous programs here, like huge bridges for only peds / bikes. need to focus on basic sidewalks on main streets before we get so stupid.

We seem to have this.

Prioritization of community needs, including the aging population, and costs.

Spend the least amount of money.

Bus fares are too high and buses have to share the road with cars, so widen the roads already!

We need to consider commute times and transit related to business and industry first. Walking and bicycles do not move the products and goods that our economy demand. We are blowing billions on poorly thought out mass transit that is too costly to build / maintain and operate not to mention inefficient to ride. Flexibility? Not the trains.

Focus on buses for the max. flexibility. More bus express lanes. Local bus control by cities not Metro. Bike fees to cover bike lanes by those who use them.

Neighbors such as Vancouver who travel to Portland to work daily. This is not addressed.

Not unless we stop building such ineffective transit like light rail and buses. There are many better options available that cost less and have much better performance. Too bad you don't seem to know about any of them.

Stop wasting money on economically unsustainable projects.

How to lower taxes for the residents of Portland. Many people in Portland are having a hard time making ends meet. The city/county taxes are way too high.

Privatize as much of the transportation services as possible. Introduce competition, and we will see improvements in services. The Federal and State governments have never spent more money than they have the last 5 years, and they used to build more roads, dams and bridges.
Eliminate all light rail projects. Instead, spend a fraction of the amounts that have been wasted on inflexible, brittle rail on better bus service. There is no need for anything else.

Most tax payers do not use it...not convenient, safe etc.

Expanding the transit system does not pencil out. rapid transit should stand on its own and not burden the community and taxpayers with its shortfalls. better to invest in better roads for the vast majority of people use autos.

Cost.

The needs of people to get where they need to be, when they need to be there.

Monopoly government transit is a failure. End Tri-Met’s monopoly and let competitors, both public and private, compete with buses and other vehicles.

Actual cost per rider mile to provide the service or availability of service, including the underlying infrastructure.

Too general could be interpreted to make more freeways not public transportation.

Loot rail is a complete waste and a boondoggle and should be abandoned.

No more loot rail, road diets, bike boulevards, bridges without cars or more room for bikes and walkers than cars, bus rapid transit, etc...we need roads.

We need roads not more toy trains and buses with dedicated lanes.

While I support transit, we also need other ways to travel that are affordable and do not cause us to waste time sitting on freeways.

Current funding level is about right.

We need more and better roads, not empty toy trains, road diets, vertical density housing, housing without parking or micro apartments.

People are individuals and don't necessarily like being group together in mass transit. Focus on clean, efficient individual transportation.

The impact of transit on roads and business.

Return on investment. Ability for people to go where they want when they want on their own schedule efficiently. A north-south westside bypass freeway is needed to sweep outside Hillsboro and down past Wilsonville to provide two bridges across the Willamette River.
While I'm sure those who are promoting "convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable transit" have good intentions, it is not sound judgment to continue spending even more money on public transit in Portland. It sure sounds good when you read it, but our lifestyles and ridership do not support further expansion of the mass transit system. Why? First, the public transit system is utilized by a very small percentage of the population. Most of us drive cars. Spending more money on mass transit will not change the fact that approximately 90% of the population in the entire Portland metropolitan area drive cars to and from work, to visit friends, to recreate, and shop. Instead, we should invest in expanding our thoroughfares, highways, and freeways to reduce traffic congestion rather than invest in even more mass transit. We should invest in electric and hybrid vehicles to reduce CO2 emissions. Second, bikes and cars do not mix. Bike accident fatalities and injuries are far above the national average. We should invest in separating cars from bike paths rather than promoting cars and bikes to share the road. Third, MAX trains are currently subsidized by the public approximately $10 per passenger. With the new light rail, this subsidized transportation will increase. I would prefer to cut back on light rail funding and focus on expanding Are you building more roads and paving/improving existing streets. Are you using traffic signals to keep vehicles moving? Are you educating drivers, bikers, pedestrians how to navigate together - i.e. bike like a car would drive, drivers look all around you for all transit options, pedestrians pick up the pace when crossing streets and look up from your cellphones.

We should consider the current situation before investing any more money. In my neighborhood public transportation is already very convenient. It's hard to imagine how it could be made more so.

Do so, if at all, within existing resources.

In Finland, bikes lanes are clearly marked on the sidewalk with bikes taking the lane closest to the road. Pedestrians have their own clearly marked lane on the sidewalk, and bikers are not endangering their lives in the street. Most importantly, there are no bikes passing cars on the right in the street. Bikes are licensed and bikers contribute to the cost of creating and maintaining bike lanes. There is none of the antipathy towards bikers by drivers and animosity of bikers towards cars. Our current system is nuts.

I bike to work often but know the average person does not want to spend the extra time like half hour to an hour and a half to take public transit. Many people enjoy a good bike ride to relax after a day of work... while most prefer to be alone and listen to the radio or listen to an e book... buy spending more and more money on something the majority do not use seems an unfitting way to take care of a building congestion and transit problem.

Monetary Cost.

Change this policy until you can operate mass transportation without the heavy subsidies. This is a fee based proposition that should not be allowed to continue to operate in the red. Make that your first priority, then implement these other feel good ideas.

Improve private vehicle movement.
How much more taxes will have to be paid? Costs and usage Focus on encouraging economic growth. A growing economy grows incomes, which would lead more people to replace older vehicles with newer, more efficient and cleaner ones.

Focus on encouraging economic growth. A growing economy grows incomes, which would lead more people to replace older vehicles with newer, more efficient and cleaner ones. Use the existing funds more effectively, make difficult choices! Parents and business have to all the time.

User fees.

Ask the voters if they would like you to spend money on this activity then LISTEN TO THEM WHEN THEY SAY NO! Don't assume we want you to find another way to fund the program.

Add travel lanes to streets and highways. Quit wasting money on flower gardens in the center of arterial streets. Put bike lanes on secondary streets. Bikes do not belong on heavily traveled streets. It is unhealthy to inhale the air on streets while on a bike.

That the riders/users of the transit system pay for more of it. The fact that TriMet has pushed through the light rail to Milwaukie, despite the communities very strong objections. TriMet's less than sparkling driving record and crime that seems to be commonplace on public transit now, should not be over looked either.

Only if voted upon.

There is not enough money available to make this pipe dream come true. Consider the population distribution with single family residences so predominant. This is not New York City.

We have already invested SO MUCH in public transit and have passed the point of diminishing returns. We should get back to taking care of the basics for now.

More lanes for passenger vehicles should be the first priority. Mass transit users should bare a larger burden of the costs, when you spend your own money you are likely to spend it wiser than when you spend other peoples money.

Streets that need paving or need repaving Study rural situations as they are different than urban areas!

I live in East County.. I am less than one block from the 162nd Max station.... with the exception to when I wish to go to maybe Downtown Portland.. or the Zoo.. I do not ride it. But METRO seems to have the idea that all citizens are wanting to throw away cars and just ride transit.. This is not the case. My car allows me to go to places that Transit does not.. or if it does.. it so infrequent that it does me no good.

It does not make sense, you need cars on the road instead creating more ineffectice public transportation. increase road(s) sizes to reduce congestion.

Cars and trucks are vital to our economy to thrive. More money and gas tax dollars need to be spent on improving traffic flow in the metro area.
Current transit policy has caused under-investment in streets and roads. Maintenance of existing infrastructure should take precedence over new construction.

Your placing bikes and mass transit in the same question. Bikes lanes are not safe with drunk drivers hitting cyclists and ppl walking. You will see more accidents if you base everything on bikes. We have an aging population that is not going to ride a bike in the rain or to a doc appt. Its not realistic. Cyclists don't pay for the damage to motorists that they do, this is NOT fair. They do not adhere to the rules of the road. I do not want to pay for a street car. We are all being taxed to death.

Cost vs benefit for those who pay the majority of the expense. Make it pay for itself. Most of the ideas considered benefit a very, very narrow special interest group. The cost, which is generally an immense amount, is assessed to everyone.

No - because no matter what -- TriMet will just continue to raise fares and eliminate fare free zones - the very things that drive people back into their cars! More busses.

The ridiculousness of reducing the streets to one lane each way to make accommodations for a bunch of bicycles. The inherent foolishness of all these extended curbs at intersections, all you are doing is making it more difficult for trucks to navigate. Remember: The reason streets were platted in the first place was to expedite the movement of freight, how much freight can any of you put on a damn bicycle?

Your labor cost per trimet worker exceeds $103,000. Reduce it to a realistic amount.

This is not a panacea. Low population density areas are not suitable to light rail and other such mass transit activities. That being said, making existing mass transit more practical with convenient, accessible, and affordable measures is important.

CRIME!!! People AND bikers not yielding to cars is an extremely bad mix.

Does the use of the route/method actually defray the cost of the route?

Priority should be given to routes with the most ridership and allow that to dictate schedule/investment.

Transit services that are supported by local business are being dramatically cut back and rider costs are rising. Clearly transit is not working.

Transit services that are supported by local business are being dramatically cut back and rider costs are rising. Clearly transit is not working.
1. Provide more frequent service over longer span of time including weekends. 2. Rationalize the route network (grid system). 3. Increase the number of frequent service route connections. 4. Provide signal prioritization for faster service where needed. 5. Use bigger (articulated) buses on heavily used routes. 6. Reestablish some 24 hour (owl) service including service to the airport. 7. Extend the MAX system to the Southwest from South Waterfront to Tualatin and serve OHSU/VA, Hillsdale, Barbur TC and PCC Sylvania with deep tunnel stations. 8. Extend MAX to Hayden Island regardless of future decisions on the CRC. 9. Consider an east side light rail connection between the Rose Quarter and OMSI. This connection would allow for the operation of fast north-south rapid transit service between Vancouver WA and Tualatin via the Tillicum Bridge and the SW Corridor. It will be needed in the future as a viable alternative to widening I-5 through the Metro Area. 10. Initiate a strategic plan for an E-W light rail tunnel between the Lloyd District and Goose Hollow to safeguard the future route and portal locations from development. The Steel Bridge will soon be incapable of handling the demand and a much faster east-west regional transit connection will be needed in order to relieve

We need an improved Road infrastructure that will support personal vehicle choices in the future. Automously guided electric vehicles will completely change our transportation landscape.

We already have limited access for cars and trucks that has increased cogerestion making a on going hardship on works and companies.

Road improvements and repair for Autos.

How many people use transit compared with tax cost per household.

How many people use transit compared with tax cost per household.

Areas and accessability.
This City has spent monies only on their pet projects, disregarding the rest of the city. They have squandered fund on Bike convenients and the west side. Now you want a person to support the options the way you want. Expand Transit system: The existing system does not support its self; They cannot take care of what they now have! Bike Routes and walking: Where do you think you are? NY?

First! Fix the roads we have! NO more new construction, unless LOCAL voters approve NEW funds!

Who gets the kickback. Who's job could be cut if we got rid of these "Projects". What if we used the money for new roads and road repairs. Abolish Metro and these "Planning" committees.

I think that Tri-met has wasted a lot of money on building the Trillium Crossing bridge and the Max line to Milwaukee.

I thought Max was great, but think the Street Cars ruin our streets, provide little benefit and lose money. Metro needs to be watched over to not waste money. Population is getting older. We get NO benefit out of walking and biking routes to transit. Provide better bus routes. Less time between trains and buses.

The high level goals are fine, building additional bike and walking routes are fine. But we all know that "providing new community and regional transit connections" is code for expanding the Max, which does not make economic or any other sense.

Mixed use of roads and create alternate routes. Buses/rail lines are great but not fun to bike/walk next to.

I would like to see our city opt out of Tri Met and create our own transit that serves our needs.

No more money should be spent on light rail. It doesn't pay for itself.

Consider needs & burdens of taxpayers and cost per mile of bus vs light rail and usage of each, i.e. actual numbers. Has licensing of bikes been considered?
Not cost effective to expand, make what currently exists cheaper.

Over 90% of the public moves by car and those are the folks that need to be accomodated. Better roads and easier access for autos. I know that isn't what you want to hear but if you want less congestion, cleaner air, etc. take care of auto traffic first.

Cost cost cost. transit is not safe anymore. that's why we don't use it.

I'm answering "no" because the question is too broad general and open ended.

No more light rail.. it is a waste of money. It cost more to run and is slower than the bus. It also bring more crime to the area.

Make sure individual motorized travelers get first priority in planning. Public Transit should be self-funded.

Abolish Metro. Metro was established to consolidate overlapping/duplicates in the three county governments. From there it went to the garbage debacle, Thanks Rena, and on to the zoo and whatever it could find to make sure it wasn't dismantled. Metro need to be abolished!

Maintenance and expansion of existing highway and road infrastructure. They are going to hell because the money collected for this purpose is being stolen by our elected officials and diverted to bicycle and mass transit systems. These people should be recalled.

I don't like the options in this question. I want more buses, more bike lanes, but can we STOP wasting money on light rail for a while? We could make a world class bus system, and scores of more miles of bike lanes if we laid off light rail for a while. And that would be awesome. So no, I don't want more money if it'll be wasted in light rail, but I would love it if it went into buses.

I took the MAX once from Hillsboro to the Airport and back. It took 2+ hours and we were late for the last bus to get us home so we had a friend pick us up. It takes less time to fly to Southern California and by car we are at the airport in under 40 minutes. My time is important and spending 4+ hours on a MAX train is not worth saving a few bucks.

The size and type of community and what those residents want by means of a public vote.

Yes or no not declared or zip code not provided

1  97006 Learn from other local light rail experiences, taking away local buses, getting rid of direct routes, taking away options and making people transfer at least once when earlier one didn't have to change.

2  97124 Bikepaths and walkways, yes. Well used. Light rail is VERY expensive to build. And it is far slower than driving in almost all circumstances I have encountered. The only way I would support this is to build express rails with fewer stops. More parking spaces at Sunset Transit!

3  97202 That we need to get away from the one-person-per-car lifestyle as soon as possible.

4  97211 Make an effort to contain the cost of providing transit. The huge expensive buses are not always necessary on every route. Look at the schools: Not every bus is an 84 passenger transit.

5  97215 Roads need to be capable of capacity reqmts.
Protecting the environment, particularly no more loss of sensitive habitat; safety of humans and non-human species; alternative transportation methods.

Somewhat, but it shouldn't be on the back of businesses.

We are spending way to much in these areas and as a result letting our highways and streets decay. We need to make big investments in our highway system to move more traffic faster.

More frequent bus service and expanded route system. Forget light rail and BRT. You have decimated our once great bus system that served more people at a cheaper price and we want it back. Until this is done, there will be a huge push-back against all your extravagant plans for us. Even when communities such as Tigard, Tualatin and Milwaukie say they don't want LRT or BRT, Metro and Trimet plow ahead as if the public doesn't exist, mor at least as if their opinions don't matter. The only way the public has value in Metro's kingdom is as serfs to be pushed around and told how to live - whether we like it or not.

How did you guys get so much power and how did Metro's mission creep occur?

It's fascinating to read the first question. The wording makes sure that only an "ogre" or a "scrooge" could answer negatively. Objectivity?

One of the problems I see with the current policy to increase the number of bike lanes in Portland is that it is increasingly difficult for automobiles and public transit vehicles to maneuver. I live in SE Portland, and my neighborhood has become less safe to maneuver. Clinton Street is a dedicated bicycle street, with center plantings every few blocks to slow traffic, and bioswales. Two blocks away, SE Division Street is becoming virtually unmaneuverable because of unchecked construction/development that is adding residents to the neighborhood without any provision for parking their cars and because bicycles continue to use Division as well. Because of the parking problems, bicycles and traffic glut, Tri Met buses often travel in the middle of both streets effectively tying up traffic going in both directions. This particularly true on SE Clinton between SE 20th and SE 26th. We need this bus!! But it's a tricky driving situation. My husband and I are senior citizens. Bicycles were once a part of our lives, but a spinal surgery prevents me from using a bike anymore; and my husband's knee surgeries prevent him from biking for transportation. What are senior citizens to do in a town that is gung-ho on bike transportation, where the weather is often so rainy or cold that even avid bikers resort to their cars, and a policy on
2. Do you support more investment by your community and our region to make biking and walking safe and convenient?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 666</td>
<td>Convience is the key word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 7089</td>
<td>Speed limit enforcement and sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 7236</td>
<td>Fixing and putting in sidewalks on busy streets in outer southeast portland as we are neglected and completely forgotten when considering these policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 9722</td>
<td>Sidewalks/walking paths in SW Portland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 97003</td>
<td>Do not destroy existing infrastructure to support the needs of the few, when those few consistently break the laws put in place to help protect them. i.e bicycle safety, bike lanes, crosswalk behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 97003</td>
<td>Making the connection between mass transit and walking to &quot;town centers&quot; easier, i.e. less walking distance. Case in point is getting from Millikan Way to Cedar Hills Crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 97003</td>
<td>Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surfacel, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 97003</td>
<td>At least shoulders on all major roads e.g. Warner Milne in OC and BEaver Creek Rd. in the rural portion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 97004</td>
<td>There should be bike paths or shoulders on all roads especially heavy used roads. There should be sidewalks or a safe place for pedestrians to walk on all roads. Pedestrians should be able to safely cross all roads with the crossing places close together as pedestrians need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 97005</td>
<td>Bike and walking paths that are not on the side of roads seem safer from cars and exhaust. However, they often don't feel as safe from other people if they are isolated. I'm not sure what the solution is, but it is a concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 97005</td>
<td>Biking and walking are good outlets in helping to make us better fit and alternate ways to the car for ourselves in taking care of everyday business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 97005</td>
<td>Connecting paths away from traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 97005</td>
<td>Density of surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 97005</td>
<td>Fill gaps in major east-west, north-south connections. Look for opportunities to also leverage connections within regional trails. Then begin to consider more proactive actions - separating bike and walking paths from traffic, look for ways to reduce number of driveways along major routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 97005</td>
<td>Focus on areas around parks and schools so that children and families can access these places safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 97005</td>
<td>I support more dedicated bicycle routes. Share the road should remain a right, BUT I still think riding along secondary routes (Routes 8 &amp; 10) on rainy dark evenings during rush hour is dangerous. Drivers are distracted and uncomfortable and more likely to not see a cyclist (even a lighted cyclist).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Washington County, East-West bike routes are limited because Beav-Hills-Hwy is unsafe west of the county line near Scholls Ferry, especially from there to Western Avenue, where an alternative is available on SE 5th.

Keeping bikes in a separate area so that they are not subject to so many hits by distracted drivers. In Europe, they even have their own lanes.

Paths to schools should take top priority.

See writing in 1. To ride a bicycle or walk oxygen is required. Oxygen is conserved using AMSOIL. Many bicyclists also use motor vehicle. Vehicles demand oil. Money to pay for bicycle and walking paths can come from AMSOIL.COM fundraising account. See fundraising written at end of 1. Consider asking the business supplying oil for your vehicle to donate profit and commission from your purchases to construct and maintain paths for walking and bicycling.

The #1 thing that will make biking and walking safer and more convenient is taking cars off the road -- please concentrate on that -- and much of the rest will follow.

This should be the #1 priority. Implementing contiguous walking and cycling routes throughout the region will make huge strides in improving our community. These routes must be safe, clearly marked for users and drivers, and well-connected to encourage people of all ages and abilities to ride/walk more.

Better ways to keep bike lanes clean so bikers are more likely to use them. Well-lit walking areas to improve safety at night or in evening during winter months.

Biking & walking to shop; biking & walking for recreation. Note the safety aspects for both.

Children walking and biking to school. Connections to natural areas and to shopping.

Get more frequent and more extensive street cleaning in place to get more debris removed from bike paths. That debris can be very nasty to our bicycle tires and makes the roads more dangerous/slippery. Also get a better separation between cars and bike paths and sidewalks. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income to subsidize road cleaning. Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Grab the low-hanging fruit first. any re-pave of a street without bike lanes should, where physically possible, have them added, either by narrowing lanes a bit or by paving a shoulder. walker road has some good bike lanes, but in some areas, they suddenly disappear. scary! walking and biking reduce traffic congestion and air pollution. they also cost little to implement and are good for general health. we should be looking for ways to promote this. we have good bike maps--those showing safer routes, but not enough people are aware of them.

I don't think active transit reflects what is intended here. i think self-propelled or human-powered transport is closer to the mark. while bike paths are dandy, they are costly and can have some drawbacks. much less expensive are decent bike lanes. i do love the completed part of the local bikeway that goes from rock creek to orchard park in hillsboro and crosses major streets, like cornell, with a biker operated crossing light.
I lost a granddaughter to a thoughtless driver of a 350-hp pickup that was jacked up too far to see her over the hoodline, even though she was in a marked crosswalk. We need alternatives that protect pedestrians and cyclists. We also need to regulate monster trucks on our roads.

It's imperative that we develop everything we can to get us out of our cars. Making clear safe passage for pedestrians not having then near traffic. Making communities more friendly to walkers and bikers. Grouping stores and restaurants, putting living and shopping closer together.

More paths that cross over freeways and major roads. Cars don't pay attention to pedestrians and cyclists. More sidewalks and bike paths, better signaling for active transportation, noise reduction along busy roads. Please make it a priority to add sidewalks near MAX stations and bus routes. I am still haunted by the news story several years ago of a young woman who was walking home from a bus stop in the dark and the rain when she was hit by a car and knocked into a ditch. Her body was not noticed until the next morning. Using public transportation shouldn't be hazardous. Also, please consider using bike lanes that are physically separated from vehicular lanes. I particularly like the configuration of sidewalk, then bike lane, then parking lane, then vehicular lane. It's much safer than putting cyclists right next to moving vehicles.

Provide a connected set of trails that provide more direct access to Intel campuses from Bethany neighborhoods.

Reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

Safety of people-powered travelers. protection from cars at intersections, from muggers on lonely pathways, etc.

The fact that those with disabilities usually cannot use such resources much, if at all. As such, an over-reliance on such strategies isn't practical for thousand of Oregonians and visitors.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

Don't kill or maim people.

How to build a safe infrastructure for bikers and walkers so that have minimal contact with motor traffic.

I live in Beaverton and it is appalling how many streets do not have curbs and sidewalks. The City wants to do all this other stuff (their visioning plan) to make the city more beautiful when they should use the money to build sidewalks and curbs to increase safety.

If there were more sidewalks next to busy streets, more people would walk and bike for trips to local grocery/strip mall or public transit. Also more streetlights and lighted crosswalks/signals to alert drivers of bike/pedestrian traffic, especially at dusk/dark. More bike corrals at more MAX stations.

Institute policies to make our communities more connected with multi-use paths. Make protecting bicycle riders a priority. Connect bike lanes and make bike paths away from roads wherever possible.
Keeps cars off the road, reduces emissions, encourages healthy lifestyle.

Kinnaman Rd is very busy now and sidewalk from thriftway parking lot to 185th would be for mainly safety.

More bike commuting routes separated from traffic is the best policy both transportation and health-wise.

More dedicated spaces for bikes. Trails, roads, paths. More people ride when they feel safe and away from traffic.

Our weather is the biggest impediment.

Out here in Aloha, not only do the bike lanes appear and disappear, there often are not sidewalks to escape to when a bike lane suddenly vanishes, leaving you inches from quarry trucks and oblivious car commuters; I'd bike to work more often if it weren't so fraught a journey.

Painting lines alongside roads does not keep cyclists separated from traffic. Consider putting in curbing, at least in high vehicle traffic areas, as is done in Denmark.

Pathways must be visible to feel safe. Going through wooded areas between neighborhoods doesn't feel safe even with street lights on the path.

Priority should be on ensuring safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Restricting current uses by auto is NOT the way to implement more bike access.

Safety of the people walking and biking on the streets.

Sidewalks and lighting, again even in outlying residential areas. I know of streets where there have been multiple car/pedestrian collisions over the past few years that are in populous residential areas - with frequent bus stops - and still totally lack sidewalks and have inadequate street lighting at night.

The easiest thing is to jump in the car--that HAS to change. When I see a young mom trying to navigate around Beaverton with a stroller my heart breaks for how completely we have shut our pedestrians out of the system.

Think connectivity and as well look to Dutch quality with respect to biking infrastructure.

Better bike lanes and pedestrian bridges.

Bring sidewalks to outer eastside of Portland, and to SW Portland.

How it fits with transit...like peds friendly bus stops.

Informing public of rights of bikes and pedestrians. Bikes have just has much right to use roads but frequently get pushed to the side by unsafe passers, etc. Pedestrians should be given priority.

License and insure bikes to offset the cost of these projects instead of raising fees and taxes on cars.

Local investment is needed, not more regional bike paths. We can get more done if people can feel safe walking in their own neighborhoods.

Safety, aesthetics, shortest distance route planning, marketing of the options focussing on specific real-world situations, solutions for shoppers (how to carry purchases), showers at places of employment (and employer support for alternate commuting), secure bike parking, FULLY connected regional and local trails.
Segregate bike lanes from motor vehicle by moving sidewalks further off the road way. Do not eliminate or shrink motor vehicle lanes.

We as a region should be doing everything we can to promote active transportation.

- Separate biking/walking for work purposes from biking/walking for pleasure as much as possible, and give priority to work related purposes. Don't ignore the recreation aspects certainly, but fund them as revenues become available.
- Consider ways to generate revenue from bikers; as users of the roads bikers need to pay a fair amount for maintenance and new bikeways. I pay a tax on each piece of fishing equipment I buy through a federal law of decades past, and the same could be done on a local level on bike related products.
- Keep the needs of bikers and walkers separate unless there is adequate space available for both. When bikers and walkers collide, walkers lose, just as bikers lose when colliding with cars.

Connecting all communities.

Higher priority should be placed upon investing in safe pathways for those who use the pathways for commuting, with a slightly lesser priority being placed upon recreation.

Is it for just recreation or will Real increase in bike use for commuting happen?

I am not a bicyclist but have had scary encounters with bicyclists in the roadway at night and on blind corners. Bicyclist vs car = disaster - the car is going to win every time. I don't want to be that kind of winner.

Should be funded with emphasis on safety.

I love that there will soon be a trail connecting Tualatin to other parts of the city so we can bike or walk further. (We used to do that in Anchorage, Alaska 25 years ago!)

This is a great investment because it not only moves people around the city without any carbon footprint, but it also helps them stay healthy.

Keeping cyclists and pedestrians safe at all times.

More lighting, less bushes close to the walk, more security.

Not penalizing home owners and neighborhoods by having them cover the cost of the infrastructure installations. Doing so reduces their house value and creates a barrier to retirement and the selling of the houses affected. Also, don't reduce traffic lanes on major thoroughfares to add bike lanes or so down traffic. (ie SE Division and Foster) Keep bike lanes on parallel roads and add more marked crosswalks instead.

This is already pretty well covered. It is important, but doesn't need as much improvement.

Again, balance is the key perspective. Bicycle contributions to the system must be identified and increased.

Biking & Walking are already SAFE !

Unsure.

Bike/walk only roads in some areas.
More bike lanes, less car lanes, more bike trails separate from car roads, more bike room on mass transit.

Pedestrians should never have to utilize traffic lanes.

Public trans connecting walking, biking corridors around freeways & major 4# lane arterials promoting much safer, designated walking & biking arterials. Vehicle drivers on large arterials, in my experience, are mostly not aware of walkers & bikers!

Put in paved shoulders or sidewalks and bikeways as part of all road paving or repaving project.

Safety.

Smat placement of bike lanes and bike registration fee to help cover costs

Analyze which streets have high volume or backups during commutes and establish nearby, bike-friendly alternatives. Evaluate frequency of bike/car or ped/car accidents and make improvements to reduce risk. Where possible, separate bike/car travel lanes. Consider making some streets bike only (except for local traffic).

Bicyclist and pedestrian safety (particularly physically separate bike lanes), bicyclist convenience (i.e. turning stop signs).

Bike paths are great, but I won't ride a bike to work and have to do battle with cars on the road.

Bike safety in rainy weather.

Biking is wonderful and I enjoy it myself. However, bikes are not cars and must be separated from motorized traffic for the safety of their often foolish and arrogant riders and the efficient movement of traffic.

Biking, walking and transit should be our top priorities for transportation dollars, in that order. Decrease priorities of freeways and new roads. Decrease funding to road widening unless it is for adding pedestrian and bike facilities.

Definitely need more sidewalks and "walkers' signals" with good lighting to make crossing busy streets safe.

Directing foot and bike traffic away from cars, identifying and targeting most dangerous intersections as priority areas.

Have some common sense. No walker or bicyclist is going to go two blocks out of their way just to bypass a congested area no matter how much safer the out-of-the-way route is. Example, Hwy 43 through north Lake Oswego. I don't even think the pavement is marked.

More sidewalks and any chance for bike paths separated by something from traffic on busier streets?

Only if the bicyclist are separated from the automobile traffic.

Oregon is about quality of life, and the ability to walk/bicycle safely will add to this. But we must be able to walk/bicycle SAFELY or people will not use this method of transportation/exercise.

Safety has to be the primary goal with accessibility also important.

We have a chance to improve bicycling outside the Portland and it should be done.

We have to raise taxes on cars & gasoline.
Whenever possible, bike and walking routes should be developed that serve to take users off roads that are and should be used by motor vehicles. If this fundamental truth finally sinks in (I have my doubts), walking and particularly biking can become a real transportation alternative.

Again, competing interests. Do not make it a one-size-fits-all. There needs to be a variety of implementation options to achieve bike/ped connectivity.

Ensuring all new-including, redeveloped-parcels and properties provide standardized sidewalks.

High number of bike and pedestrian accidents recently...need to increase safety in high traffic areas. Highest priority.

Making certain that major arteries are bikable so that using a bike for transportation is a very real possibility for more people.

Move the bikes off the streets; keep them separate from vehicles and pedestrians.

To an extent. People don't do this sort of activity getting to work. Remember it rains in the Portland Metro area: walking, biking, pushing strollers, using wheelchairs or other mobility devices, skateboarding, and rollerblading just isn't feasible for most folks as a method of commuting. It all sounds like something some idealistic young hire pulled outa their rectum.

We should encourage people to bike and walk by making it as easy, safe, and pleasant as possible. This means taking away road space from cars, which will be politically unpopular, but it is a necessary step. Architect Jan Gehl in Copenhagen has helped several communities around the world implement similar measures, and we should learn from his example.

Especially making sure that sidewalks connect. Often there are some sidewalks and then they run out and pedestrians must walk on the road. Also walkers should be taken into consideration during roadwork.

People need safe access to groceries.

Rural areas should have consideration in bike planning. There are not enough safe streets to bike on in rural areas!!!!!!

CAN you make it safe. Just putting in a bike lane on a busy road is NOT making it safe - it is more giving the ILLUSION that it is safe which is horrible and will end up creating more of a danger than it currently might have. Make it safe by slowing down or restricting traffic in these places.

Consider safe routes to schools and major bikeways.

Cost.

Could we use urban renewal funds to connect parks, businesses, etc.

Don't add bike lanes at the expense of reduced road capacity for automobiles and busses.
Don't raise taxes to do it.

Expand connections between communities. Sacrifice scenic expansions to commuter connections. Tourism is wonderful, but most rural roads are not safe areas for bicycle lanes, and getting to work, schools, and stores should pre-empt tourism as goals.

I believe we would need cooperation from private property owners to allow bike and walking paths to proceed through their property if needed. In Europe you see this managed very well.

I would like more bike trails.

Improving in high risk areas both safety and traffic flow.

It is important to give walkers and bikes separated paths for safety and keep bikes off busy streets.

More bike lanes in areas outside of cities in Clackamas County. Many would bike to work and activities but there are few bike lanes. Example is Beavercreek Rd past Henrici.

Make sure you realize we need roads as well not take away roads to make bike routes ONLY.

Making certain that getting to schools, healthcare facilities, and groceries/pharmacies is safe and convenient.

Making spearate bkie lanes and/or sidewalks to keep cyclists and pedestrians out of traffic lanes for their safety.

More bike and ped connectivity. More services along bike and ped routes just like we try to do with transit corridors. Engage in Safe Route to Schools programs to ensure a new generation of bike and ped commuters.

Providing to users pay their fair share...i.e. Bikers need to be paying for their bike lanes.

Safe places to bike/walk that don't compete with traffic. In high traffic areas (ie. 213 and Beavercreek Rd), it'd be nice to have pedestrian bridges so we don't need to compete.

Safety and usability by students, workers, and shoppers, not just recreational paths for leisure activities.

Separate bicycle traffic from auto traffic.

The share of the investment that is carried by those using these improvements, how do we fund such that the burden is properly placed.

This is good for health and the environment.

We've asked automobile operators to support the roadway infrastructure. It is time to ask bike riders to help support upgrades supporting their safety and travel.

Where it is logical to make bike routes and walking routes. You can hardly say spring water trail would get anyone to work.

Bike paths and routed that do not share space on heavy car and truck traveled streets.

Improve the trails and bike walk lanes...don't need new ones.

Bike lanes are not enough. "Bike only" roads are safer, pleasant, and will attract more users.

Again, make sure the lower income areas, especially in East county are served.
I support more biking and walking trails, but not at the expense of removing dollars from increasing roadway capacity, etc.

Improvements should not reduce traffic flow and should be paid for by users.

THE BIKERS OUGHT TO BE CONTRIBUTING FINANCIALLY AS MUCH AS THE DRIVERS DO. THEY GET IT ALL AND HAVE NO OBLIGATION FOR IT.

Focus on locations that will allow people to reach transit more easily.

Portland is a destination—tourists, shopping, your own people visiting. The safer and more available the more it will get used. You are setting a national standard that exceeds the rest of the country and green is important.

Cost.

Don't know.

Other items of importance.

Prioritize areas based on neighborhoods. This will be a long-term plan and it will take some time to implement. But have a plan that prioritizes this effort based on neighborhoods so that all are involved.

Quit paving sidewalks with posts and signs stuck in the middle.

Recognize that complete streets is considered a roadway investment, and that is where the emphasis should be placed.

Stop reducing corporate taxes, fair share taxing policies.

We all need to walk more for our health. Healthy people means less medical expenses = more more for infrastructure. I know there are many steps in-between. Pun intended :-)

Also public service messages and bike safety. I had an intern that wanted to bike to work but she had trouble with the rules on bike riding and how drivers of cars didn't know the rules.

Being able to get to and from GOOD transportation options by walking short and safe distances!

Bike paths away from streets.
First, I want more bike routes. Bike lanes on arterial roads aren't enough; those plus off-street paths along streams or railroads are better yet still not enough. The Portland approach of designating and reconfiguring streets paralleling major streets as bike boulevards gets the region closer to true bikeability. Second, fix a "last mile" problem. It remains hit or miss in the region about whether there will be bike parking at destinations and whether it's sheltered from the elements and secure. Also, for apartment living, it's hit or miss whether developers provide meaningful bike parking so a tenant doesn't have to drag a bike out of a balcony to the front door, if a lease even permits outdoor storage. A communal bike parking garage or canopy area for apartment buildings and/or by-unit bike closets or racks near front doors are what I envision. I know too well the conflict of securing bikes outdoors under stairs with the need to keep areas under stairs clear for fire and life safety reasons (supposedly). I want development regulations to these effects. Basically, if bikes get parking and transport treatment akin to cars, that would go a long way to getting more riders and fewer car trips.

Safety. I love that there will soon be a trail connecting Tualatin to other parts of the city so we can bike or walk further. (We used to do that in Anchorage, Alaska 25 years ago!).

School children and creating safe routes to school and downtown Tualatin.

The connectivity of trails is so important. In Anchorage, Alaska, we used to bike from our house in Muldoon all the way to almost downtown to watch the baseball games in the summer. It was awesome. To be able to get from Point A to Point B without encountering traffic lights would be awesome. In Anchorage, there were underpasses that wildlife also used to avoid crossing major roads.

This is my #1 thing. I would love to see a walking and bike path all the way along Boones Ferry Road (upper and lower) so one could conceivably bike from Wilsonville to downtown.

While striking a balance between biking and walking, in any decision walking should take priority over biking, especially in funding. Most of us walk only some of us ride, we are born with feet not wheels.

You cannot take traffic lanes from roads and expect a good overall outcome.

Bike and walking paths that connect to shopping areas and parks.

Bike right turn lanes should be shared with autos.

Bike routes that cyclists know are designated and planned for safety, bike lanes and barriers for those lanes, sidewalks or walking paths.

Cement blocks to designate bike lanes- shift curbside parking one lane over on main bike thoroughfares.

Connectivity - identify gaps.

Equitable amongst all neighborhoods and income levels.

I want the region to invest more in making biking and walking safer and more convenient. Biking and walking projects are less expensive than road/highway projects. Biking and walking projects create jobs, reduce greenhouse gas emission and provide many other benefits to our health, safety, livability and to our economy.
Major areas where biking is consistently used. Have bike paths along any road that is traveled heavily.

Natural routes, rather than trying to force people's behavior, tying shorter local routes in with larger scale trails, requiring developers to include trails, safety.

This approach works great for folks that want to live in a dense, highly urban environment. Will all new neighborhoods become highly urbanized centers?

We need to make it safe to walk. While I appreciate our emphasize on biking--we are NOT the Netherlands which is flat, most people are not going to bike to work and back, however, I do believe that more people would walk their neighborhoods to the stores, to schools etc if there were sidewalks.

Would be great to have dedicated bike lanes f that would keep the bikes off of the regular roads, otherwise no point.

Adequate funding so biking to work is safer. Dedicated paths separated from vehicles will encourage more people to bike. People don't ride if they think they'll get hit.

Bridges of all sizes should be made safe for bike/ped crossings.

Consider the 8/80 approach. If it is safe and walkable for an 8 year old and an 80 year old, then it will be safe and convenient for the majority of the population.

Few sidewalks are located in the Mount Sylvania area near Portland Community College.

Focus on safety improvements. Many people who want to bike are worried about conflicts with vehicles or too timid to bike on busy streets. Provide good alternatives.

Give tickets to bikers who break the law! Many of them think they own the road/sidewalks. Make bicycle lanes safer/wider/more connected to where they need to go, so they don't have to ride out in traffic with motorized vehicles. Have free bicycle safety/vehicle law events so they know the rules. For walkers, make walking paths for walkers only, wide and well-lit, many with handrails, through safe areas, with more connectivity to businesses. More people would walk if it was easier and safer. This would increase their quality of life.

I am an outdoors nut so I can definitly say yes to this.

More local control of implementation. Local decision makers understand the specific issues of a community better.

More metered crossings and enforce the rules for all bike riders. Only children should be allowed to ride on sidewalks.

More sidewalks in the Mount Sylvania area.

Secondarily to vehicle traffic concerns many more people drive than bike and shall, even if you increased bike lanes 100x.

To the greatest extent possible, bike paths should be physically separated from vehicle travel lanes and street, particularly for out of local area travel (arterials and major collectors).
Where it is needed more, not just where the "vote" is, but where the need is...looking at demographics and lifting a few communities with better access. For example, I see more need in Oregon City than in Wilsonville where I live and there is free service.

Fill in sidewalks in unincorporated areas. Many sidewalks start and stop without a road shoulder to move onto. I do not care so much about the biking aspect. Bikes are vehicles and they can use the existing road ways.

Make the biking and walking improvements close to schools first.

More sidewalks.

Perhaps regular press relief events with print and electronic media touting benefits of biking and the expansion of infrastructure as it happens.

See previous comment - lack of sidewalks and bike lanes make it risky to do either in Beaverton/Aloha. I want to bike however, I've considered jumping into a blackberry filled culvert as an alternative to being hit by a dump truck.

Walking should be encouraged just as much as biking.

Access to natural areas.

Before bikes, cars and buses we were walking. I think this should always be on the top of the list when things are planned.

Better east-west traffic FLOW east of 205. Morning and evening commuters should NOT have to stop at every stop light heading east and west. Time the lights, and make pullouts for the busses. Don't have a bus stop every block, or if you do, only stop there half the time. DON'T LET WALKERS SET THE PACE OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS.

Bikes before cars.

Biking as a means of transport needs more support in this country. To me, the most important aspect of biking as a commuter is safety. And to me, safety means separation of bikes and cars.

Connectivity.

Cost. Many neighborhoods throughout Metro should be included, not just trendy. Remember, Gresham is a larger city than all other Metro cities except Portland.

I think there is not enough out of the box decision making in this regard, we've made ourselves to rigid. I know it's expensive to put in sidewalks for pedestrians, wouldn't it be great to just throw down bark chips or an asphalt trail (like park asphalt trails) in areas along roads where it is possible to do it rather than waiting for the sidewalk fairy to arrive.

Maintain existing and include that cost in what's added.
More sidewalks, safer sidewalks. If you have a crosswalk, make sure it has lights. DO NOT PUT A SIDEWALK IN THE MIDDLE OF A BLOCK JUST SO HIGH SCHOOL KIDS CAN STOP TRAFFIC WHILE SEEKING AN OFF CAMPUS SNACK (IE GRESHAM HIGH).

No additional money. Use road taxes instead.

Pedestrians are getting short shrift. we need more enforcement of traffic laws so that pedestrians can safely use the means already provided, as well as increasing safe crossings.

Sidewalks were there are none.

Target limited efficient investments only in existing problem areas (eg high current foot traffic with high danger).

There absolutely MUST be a way to tax bicyclists for the cost of creating these bikeways. I am not against bicycles having specially marked lanes, etc. but it is wrong that I am required to pay for them but the people who use them do not. I do not wish to continue to subsidize something which benefits a minority.

Walking paths should be well-lit and in the open, not tucked behind buildings.

Areas with no sidewalks and improvements to existing walkways in some places walking is not an option not safe or pleasant.

Bikes, pedestrians & cars should be comngled, which will slow down the cars.

For this to be effective, it would be ideal if some local awareness about unsafe driving with crosswalks and bicycles on the road were facilitated. Also, the limited access to bicycles or cold weather clothing for bikers and pedestrians should be considered when encouraging safe walking and biking.

Making sure walking paths are well lit at night.

Priority should be given to arterials and minor arterials to bring these streets up to safe biking and walking standards first. Consider reducing speed limits to 25 on unimproved minor arterials to protect pedestrians and bicyclists- until improvements are made. State law may need to be changed to do this.

Sidewalks in areas that don't have them. Downtown signals that allow walk all ways while all traffic stops. That would move folks faster than the current way of right turners waiting for pedestrians. Overpasses for pedestrians and bicycles over freeways.

Better lighting. Teaching people to be safe. I see people walking at night in dark clothing in unlit areas and it is a wonder more of them are not hit.

How to connect various areas safely.

I see so many young people walking at night in dark clothing. How about pushing some more information in schools on safety, like wearing white or reflective clothing, using flashlights, or other ways to make themselves more visible.

If street people laws are enforced it should immediately be safer, ie... springwater corridor.
Local usage - prioritize sidewalks and bike lanes where they will be most used.

Making it clear to individuals the proper behavior between bicycles and automobiles on the road.

Rural communities are so lacking this regard that careful establishment of criteria and setting of priorities needed. Further this policy should be mandated for all new residential developments as well as schools and to connect parks etc.

Minimize mixing cars and motor vehicles when possible; all decision-makers should be required to bus to work at least once a week to get a sense of the tyranny of motorists. Main bike routes should not be through streets for motors--barriers every six blocks on these route Physically preventing motor access. Rumble-strip border for bike lanes. Educate drivers as to the definition of crosswalk and enforce violations Start getting sidewalks on all residential streets, then all streets. Work-based incentives for getting there without a car. Explore and heal the animosity among cyclists, cops, motorists.

Separating bike and pedestrian paths, and separating those both from vehicle traffic. Sidewalks should be required for all new constructions and a comprehensive plan to add sidewalks to existing neighborhoods without them should be developed and implemented, either by narrowing roadways, taking easements from property owners, or both.

TV Highway/Canyon Road needs better safety for pedistrians and cyclist. Better connection between western Washington County and the rest of the County (Hillsboro, Forest Grove).

We need safe, convenient alternatives to cars. Short distance should encourage walking and biking.

We need to get as many bicycles off public streets and highways by moving them to separated paths dedicated for their use.

Implementing this policy should not be at the expense of existing infrastructure.

Pervious surfaces, lighting powered by solar.

Protected bike lanes-- separate them from automobile traffic. Enforce traffic laws for bicycles, who frequently run stop lights and sail through stop signs without slowing down.

Bike lanes are essential. Right now in many areas bikes are "sharing the road" with cars and this makes for a very dangerous situation. The same for walking and sidewalks.

Bike lanes between the curb and the parked cars. Allowing small grocery/drug stores inside large residential zoned areas.

I would support this, hands down, before support any expansion of roads.

Keeping bicycles visible to cars or to have dedicated bike lanes or paths.

More funding for such projects.

Review which areas have the most walking and bicycle traffic and then make sure that there are safe places for both pedestrians and bicyclists to use that is out of traffic and there are no gaps in the links.

Sidewalks are the highest priority as more people walk than ride bicycles for exercise.
Walking and biking cannot be considered on the same level of priority as motorized transportation. For example, families with small children or persons carrying packages will prefer motorized transport for speed and safety. Weather considerations will also keep walking and biking as a secondary transportation method in the region.

While relatively few people use walking and biking to commute, they are certainly the most vulnerable. Keeping them safe is very important.

Additional investment should be limited; I do support some more investment but our biking and walking system seems quite good at present and does not need too much more support.

Biking and/or walking pathways separated from traffic, not just painted lines on pavement.

Can you even get from one side of most Malls to the other by walking? Look at Washington Square with the Malls on either side of a freeway without a crossing.

Funds should not be taken out of roads. Bikes need their own funding scheme.

Important, but maintaining existing transportation infrastructure should be the top priority. Do not take resources away from road maintenance to make NEW investments in bike/ped facilities. Find new resources for bike/ped. Consider user-funded bike/ped improvements through bicycle registration and/or licensing. (Yes, most bicyclists also own a registered vehicle, but bicycle registration would go a long way toward responding to criticism that a disproportionate amount of funding goes toward bike infrastructure at the expense of a much larger majority of roadway users).

More bike lanes. More education for drivers and bikers.

Not as key as transit because it is weather-dependent and not an option for most to reach his/her workplace due to distance.

Primary roads have lanes. Add lanes to all secondary roads before expanding networks.

Roadways for bicycles only. Steep fines for people who intimidate or hit bicyclists.

The ages and income levels of the neighborhoods, i.e., children, teens, people with small children and infants, seniors, the disabled. Paths should be separated so bikes and pedestrians don't have to compete for the same space, should be smooth and well maintained and either lighted for night use or closed so there is no danger in the dark. Paths should connect with homes, work and recreation.

The ages and lifestyles of the people in the region. I'm a senior citizen and enjoy walking to and from different places but the light signals are sometimes not long enough for me to get across streets safely. Also, there are children of all ages in my neighborhood and bike riders who must compete with cars.
We need parity - right now our systems are paying lots of lip service to 'active transport' but 95% of resources still go to cars. We have had a big construction project in Hillsboro with lots of information about how cars can get around the construction project but ALMOST NOTHING to help pedestrians. Signs announce "business open" but there was no way a pedestrian could get there without walking in TV Hwy. How safe is that?!? The only bus stops and signalized crosswalks around Tuality Hospital and many doctors offices were closed - but of course cars could always get to them. It's really been frustrating! "A few blocks" detour adds a mile to walk - your try that loaded down with groceries or using a walker!

All new developments and new roads on open land need to have both sidewalks and bike lanes. A development includes remodeling an existing structure.

Being goal oriented in sidewalk connectivity - school walk routes first then transit, etc. bicycle buffer lanes over cycle tracks (don't like the feeling of darting in and out of traffic for these and uncomfortable to ride).

Bike and walk paths should have no breaks from home to work or to trains or buses.

Biking is pretty well supported in the city. Biking from other areas is inconvenient and often dangerous.

Change infrastructure and work to change attitudes. Look to Denmark and the Netherlands for models. Make safe so that all will engage (not just fear-immune young males).

Connecting safe bike routes. Separating bicycles from cars as much as possible. Develop more 'rails to trails'. Make sure there is safe, secure, dry bicycle parking available for people at transit stops.

Consider land uses and relative demands when prioritizing enhancements for peds and bikes. Avoid sidewalks or bike lanes to nowhere. Bike lanes should be buffered or separated when speeds exceed 30 mph.

Cost and whether or not the community does indeed want improved bike lanes. I seriously feel that walking safety should first be considered prior to biking needs.

Equity!

However, traffic laws must be obey by bicyclists. Obeying stop signs, for instance. Proper front and rear lighting. Many bicyclists are a danger to themselves and to other traffic. Some have a 'chip on their shoulder' and think they are above the law. Enforce the laws. They are there for good reasons.

I hate the way WA Co has "now you see it, now you don't" bike lanes. We need continuous bike lanes or at least a shoulder to ride on, and I DON'T mean gravel on the side of the road which is what the City of Hillsboro sees as a bike lane. We need SAFE places to ride our bikes or people will put their bikes in their cars to drive to where it is rural enough to ride more safely.

I support sidewalks for walking. However, we have invested enough in biking. There is a very small population of people who bike but everyone uses the sidewalks. There should be more investment in getting people to walk places.

Identify locations with highest safety concerns, set priorities.

More bike paths that are separate from the street.
Multi-use paths separated from traffic are the safest, most enjoyable and inspiring places to travel using active transportation. When considering bike lanes on busy roads, also consider reducing speeds and including other safety features if it is not possible to create a completely separate path for non-motorized vehicles.

Need to manage skateboarding and rollerblading for their participants can't injure the walkers.... Again, I won't feel safe walking with our kids if there are very many skateboarders or people rollerblading. I just won't use the routes & get upset that I'm paying for them.

People who insist on a rural environment (e.g. Old Orenco) should not have power to block sidewalks on all streets in their area, unless they are also willing to give up driving cars on those streets.

Please do more in Washington County. one of the main hindrances for employees to bike commuting is feeling safe.

Priority to sidewalks in neighborhoods and within urban growth boundaries.

This would be hugely beneficial! I hope that this becomes a high priority.

Use i.e. transportation to/from work or recreation. Connections to Max, bus, etc.

We need to make sure their are adequate sidewalks and crossings before we worry about bike paths.

Yes, Hillsboro is lacking in proper sidewalk access. However, I feel it is best to get bikes off of the roads and maybe make a bike path that is away from cars. I am scared to ride my bike on the road, even in the bike lane, in fear that someone will hit me. I prefer to ride my bike along scenic trails that cars are not allowed on!

The problem with this good sounding policy is that money is taken from the means of transportation that most of the are residents and businesses use, cars and trucks. A reality that our 'planners' seem to consistently miss is that the overwhelming majority transportation is done through cars and trucks. Eliminating lanes of transport of this favored means will only result in more gridlock and increased costs.

More bike paths (obviously). Place buffers between streets and sidewalks to make pedestrians (and cyclists) feel safer.

More protection from inattentive drivers for walkers and bikers. As a frequent walker, there is not a week that goes by that I would not have been hit by a driver trying to make a right turn on a red light without watching for pedestrians, had I not been watching for them.

Once again, it needs a long range strategic that we can build toward. Something like assuring utility right-of-ways have paths and bike lanes, instead of congesting traffic areas with bikes.

Pedestrians. When combining biking and pedestrian areas, bikers tend to disrupt and render unpleasant the pedestrian experience. We all want to experience our beautiful areas, some of us prefer the pace of walking without having to constantly move out of the way of impatient bicyclists.
Require safe sidewalks in all residential and commercial areas. Developers and owners should be required to provide a safe place to walk along their property frontages. Provide a no-mans' land between bike lanes and vehicle traffic.

Safety of pedestrians. Perfect example: The Tualatin Wildlife Refuge is accessible by pedestrians/transit riders in one direction only. There is no crossing on highway 99 to the refuge. It therefore requires an extra hour of bus rides/bus waits, to go to the refuge from the south side (riders must ride to the first "safe" crossing on highway 99 - Durham Rd.) and wait for the bus to Sherwood to access the refuge, or they must walk unsafely from Sherwood along the north side bike lane (no sidewalks) against rapid and erratic traffic along highway 99 to the refuge. Just one of at least hundreds of difficult accessibility issues connecting our community with our treasures. Unfortunately, there are even more entirely inaccessible metro areas; including a surprising number of Portland Parks and Recreation activities that are inaccessible to transit riders.

Separate bikeways should be considered for commuting trunk ways where feasible. Separate biking areas safely along roads.

The availability of street sweeping services. Currently many of the biking facilities in SW Metro are almost useless during the fall; bike lanes filled with small tree limps, pine needles, and leaves make using the bike lanes almost impossible. Separation of transit modes. I love many of the current mixed use paths that are in place across Metro, however do to the fact many run through parks there are frequently pedestrians using the system are there for recreation as opposed to transportation. It seems that in planning a MUP can be seen as an alternative to bike lanes in many areas in SW Metro, in many places this should not be the case. You wouldn't route highway traffic through a neighborhood do to the differences in the needs of the user and the infrastructure, I feel that in many cases the MUP system has a similar failing. People using the park systems to recreate, which in my opinion is a fantastic use of both the Metro's time and funding, and cyclists using the MUP systems as transit which does not seem to be conducive to the design of much of the system. I would love for there to be a bicycle greenway system across the SW Metro, similar to the system in SE Portland. I know that both do the size of the SW Metro and the many different stakeholders involved this is a highly unlikely request, but I thought I would mention it.

This definitely needs to be a top priority because it has the most direct impact on traffic and pollution reduction. Separating walking and cycling from cars will entice more people to do these activities.

Animal habitats (natural and preserves).

Better sidewalks in the SW part of Portland would be a start.

Bicycles, skateboards, rollerblades and segways need to be removed from pedestrian zones and their usage on sidewalks need to be fined. This needs to be enforced as they make sidewalks and other pedestrian areas unsafe, which leads to antipathy towards their usage by those who want to walk safely, e.g. oldsters or families especially.
Bike lanes are great but not always safe, especially when they cut through lanes of traffic or merge into lanes of traffic. More byways specifically for pedestrian and cyclist use would be nice.

Certain areas of the city exemplify incredibly good urban design for pedestrians. For example, portions of the Pearl District demonstrates an excellent balance of green landscaping (with native plants), ample sidewalks, curb cuts-outs to slow automobiles, ample stop signs and pedestrian crossings, and pedestrian pathways disrupting the street pattern (ex, portions of NW Kearny). These are design components that have been tested and verified to encourage pedestrian uses. They should become standard practice. I have visited many land-use and neighborhood meetings, and I know that the wealthier areas are able to advocate good design for themselves. But income shouldn't dictate this good design. The city of Portland would reap great rewards by using low-cost, proven pedestrian design to encourage healthy lifestyles, improved economic conditions via more shops capitalizing on foot traffic, better neighborhood safety, and higher tax revenue through housing values.

Connecting walkways and bikeways should be a priority. Not creating or maintaining current bikeways. It is frustrating to be on a path and have it randomly end.

Dedicated routes that reduce potential collisions and conflicts between bicycles, other vehicles, and pedestrians.

Driver and bike education to reduce conflict.

Driver convenience.

Enforcement of traffic laws needs to be considered alongside improving the infrastructure for alternative modes. Even in very walkable/bikeable parts of the city careless or malicious drivers are able to harass, injure, and kill cyclists and pedestrians with relative impunity. Running red lights and operating vehicles (bikes or cars) while distracted needs to be deterred much more severely and consistently.

Focus more on sidewalks and less on bike paths. For the number of bikers vs cars, the city is skewing too much to bikers that result in cars not being able to park or drive safely.

For safety purposes, there should be more walk/bikeways that are not used by cars/buses at all.

How fast it can be implemented. The sooner the better.

I live downtown and would ride a bike everywhere if there were more dedicated bike lanes like on Broadway by PSU. I just got back from a business trip to Amsterdam and the dedicated bike lanes there are great. Everyone bikes. Such an infrastructure in PDX is the dream!

Increase opportunities for safe bike commuting.

Investment should be for walking, not biking, as it affects more people.

More sidewalks especially along heavily traveled auto routes.

Neighborhoods and transit corridors without any public investment in sidewalks and areas where the speed of traffic exceeds the posted or desired limits.
Parity for these modes with private cars and public transit.

Particularly interested in more sidewalks in more places. Not everyone does or will cycle, but all kinds of people use sidewalks—even people who don't walk (wheelchairs, strollers, etc.). Getting people out who seldom walk anywhere is key to increasing health and wellbeing in our community.

Provide sidewalks as a matter of civic responsibility in every community. They should not depend on developers or homeowners. Keep a balance of options for bikes and pedestrians.

Reduce and enforce Speed limit for cars and other mother vehicles! It's impossible to cross some streets because cars just wiz by!

See previous comment.

Separate bike lanes from traffic. Don't forget lighting along sidewalks.

Sidewalks AND PAVED STREETS.

Sidewalks in outlying areas so people can safely walk to transit stations. This is another big must-have for our region.

Sidewalks, especially to bus stops, matters. If people can't easily walk to a stop, then they are less likely to use public transit.

Since lots of residents don't/can't bike at all, keep working on avoiding conflicts of bikes with peds and auto drivers.

Start with schools. Where do the kids live? Can you provide safe paths for them to walk to their schools?

This should be a very high priority.

This should have a lower priority than public transportation.

Walking and biking are worthwhile and necessary options to protect, but they will not get rid of automobile traffic. Do NOT, PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE DO NOT, take traffic lanes from well traveled streets for bikes only. Move them one block over and protect their travel there. Forcing a shared roadway on an already frequented throughway will only piss off everyone involved who has to travel on that street.

Focus on sidewalks in high walk areas first. People should not be dying due to no safe place to walk. This should be higher priority than bike improvements close in to pdx - more cross walks with the flashing lights. These are great when driving at night & pedestrians are dressed in black.

1. I would be in favor of a few protected bike lanes rather than many striped bicycle lanes, if I had to choose between the two. 2. Road diets for multilane roads that are not being fully used (i.e. reduce road from 3 lanes to 2 lanes, then add protected bicycle lane and/or wider sidewalk).

Accessibility to showers for bike commuters.

Add more curb bump outs.

Adding some kind of license and tax on bikes

Again, please put safety first. Remove parking, lower speed limits - it is in our best interest as a region.
Again, prioritize areas where the greatest number of people will benefit and areas that have the highest likelihood of people walking and biking.

All other forms of urban transportation; pedestrian, cycling, mass transit should be given priority over resources into new automobile infrastructure.

Alleviating dangerous connections/crossings, improving visibility at intersections.

Also think about interactions between bicycles and pedestrians--how to avoid them!

Better bike blvd signage that alerts intersecting traffic that they are crossing a bike blvd and to watch for bikes- very needed along SE Spokane.

Better lighting and sight lines at crossings.

Better manage (improve marking?) to prevent cars using bike and park lanes as right turn lanes; nearly crashed while making correct right turn by car zooming around to turn right in bike lane ignoring my right turn signal. License was Calif so perhaps did not understand bike lane usage. Signage would be helpful or warn of fines.

Bike & walking lanes and trails, lighting, traffic patterns & safety.

Bike paths, bike lanes or bike friendly sidestreets are common all around Portland. I think signage on major streets w/o bike lanes that directs people to the nearest bike route would be helpful. I would even be ok with some streets closed to bicycles for everyone's safety and other streets limited to bikes and local traffic. Continue to upgrade bike lanes and yellow zones at stop lights.

Bike routes that avoid car and truck traffic safe bike parking easy structures on trains and busses to hold bikes ways to carry small child size bikes.


Biking and walking are safe, healthy, and convenient ways to commute for many residents but there are many areas of the city which are not friendly to bikes and pedestrians. Expanding bike ways to new regions, and creating "bike boulevards" (bike only streets) will help to promote a higher rate of bicycle transportation. Improving the safety of pedestrian crossings throughout the city by adding flashing light signage, stop lights, and or speed bumps will improve walk-ability for commuters and especially students.

Building walking and bicycling infrastructure is way, way cheaper than building motorized vehicle infrastructure. Encouraging people to walk and bicycle saves everyone money. Other benefits include: - Cleaner air, water and soil. - Healthier people. - Fewer wars over fossil-based, combustible energy. - Friendlier neighborhoods.

Cars are not almighty. People need to walk for health and they should be able to do it safely.
Cost coupled with equity. Do the projects that offer the biggest bang for the buck AND the greatest increased service to communities with lower incomes and less infrastructure. Avoid, for now, the fanciest, expensive things like bridges and tracks that require tons of changes to existing infrastructure.

Cost/benefit analysis of proposed projects. Encouraging bicycles to use routes with less vehicular traffic.

Designating quieter streets (when possible) as biking streets with special road markings is a great idea and should be expanded.

Emphasizing and enforcing current crosswalk laws so people know that when I'm in an unmarked crosswalk – it's still a crosswalk! Having walking paths that have priority over car traffic (like a few places on the Springwater Trail) would be great. More public restrooms so if you walking several miles you have places to go instead of trying to sneak into McDonalds.

Encouraging more biking/waking has both direct and indirect benefits to climate health and health care.

Enforce cars stopping for pedestrians. Make it financially painful for vehicle traffic that doesn't do so. Higher penalties for hit-and-run.

Environmental air quality and the health benefits related to cleaner air. Mental health benefits due to a more active lifestyle. Connecting people to businesses in areas they may not otherwise regularly visit.

Equity. All of the Metro area should get these investments - you should feel comfortable biking on 90% of the city's streets. Obviously not Powell, or 82nd.

Even though I will ride nearly anywhere, 365 days a year, most people won't unless we improve our infrastructure and make it as easy as possible to access all parts of the city via bicycle.

Extending bike and pedestrian amenities to underserved neighborhoods. Also safe routes to schools.

Find the places where sidewalk or pathway improvements are going to connect the most people to important places such as schools or grocery stores. Prioritize keeping our kids safe and our locally-owned stores/economy thriving.

First easy step - increase awareness of Oregon's crosswalk law (every intersection, not just the striped ones, are crosswalks).

Focus bicycling investments on separated bikeways that access downtowns, neighborhood centers, all levels of schools, regional attractions (e.g., Thorns, Timbers, and Blazer games, OMSI, etc...), etc... Invest in sidewalks that connect neighborhoods to stores, bus stops, schools.

Focus investment in places with the greatest density and ability to encourage and support short trips of less than three miles one-way.

For bike projects, a priority should be given to completely separating bikes from cars. Shared facilities are bad for both modes. Bikes should not be allowed on car facilities and vice versa. Too many cyclists make up there own rules on the road and want to blame the car driver when something goes wrong.
Funding for off-road trails to ensure access to those who are uncomfortable using the street system. This will bring the broadest group to biking.

Give bikes and walkers priority.

Got to be separated from auto/bus/truck traffic. Safety again.

How these new policies and the construction that goes along with them will affect other forms of traffic—will it slow things down?

Huge, huge YES, I SUPPORT.

I already wrote that.

I do think folks should be able to bike and walk but I also think that City of PDX spends more $ on this than they should. Some streets should not have designated bike lanes esp if a bike street is one street away. Educating Bike riders would help re traffic laws plus a fee on bike registration for commuters on bikes.

I live in Brooklyn, my son attends Grout ES and is bussed to Boys and Girls Club in the afternoon. My biggest challenge as a driver in this area is not killing bikers....and the reverse is the same for when I'm biking. Streets are narrow and sidewalks are heavily utilized. Bikers are left to ride on a narrow street (Milwaukie Ave) that is packed with parked cars and heavy traffic. I don't know what the solution is for such a highly used area, but I know it's an issue. Ideas?

I support this and I don't think it would take a lot of money to make improvements targeting the least walkable/bikeable parts of the city.

I think a priority should be placed on bringing the outer areas of our region up to the level of inner Portland. I think safety and making improvements in the highest risk areas should be a priority. Where there is room I would like to see innovative and agenda pushing changes - like the recent 3rd Ave public space. Lets be a national leader again.

I would definitely pay a tax if I knew it would build sidewalks and bike lanes. Equity is the biggest emphasis, and east county is sorely needing of safer walking & cycling infrastructure.

I would like to see more barriers put up on the so-called bike boulevards such as Clinton Street. Make it safer for bikes by limiting car access on the bike boulevards. Cars should not be able to drive more than a couple of consecutive blocks on the bike blvds.

I'd like to see bike-only streets in Portland.

Identify problem areas without sidewalks or areas that are high use that need repairs. Adaptive low light, low energy lighting for these pathways. Remove them from roadsides and roadways.

Improve bike lane safety/separation.

Increasing the number of completely separate bike routes, as in routes not adjacent to roads.
Increasing the number of people who bike and walk in our region can have outstanding public health benefits by:

1) increasing physical activity, thereby decreasing chronic diseases like diabetes and heart disease

2) Increasing the safety for bikers and walkers because of the safety in numbers mechanism, and also, of course, by prioritizing safety for bikers and walkers in the design and construction of ALL road projects

3) Reducing air pollution emissions by getting people out of cars and on their feet.

It excites me to think of the amount of short trips that could easily be replaced by walking or biking if our active transportation network was highly connected. This is important for me and the health of our city.

Keep bikes on the street and off the sidewalks. Streamline the traffic laws to make bikes more like cars. No passing on the right or on the lane line between stopped traffic.

Make sidewalk infill in deficient areas (E Portland, SW Portland, Aloha, Oak Grove, etc.) the #1 active transportation priority.

Make sure this happens in all parts of the region.

Making bike and walking corridors places that community members are empowered to care for and take ownership over within their own neighborhoods.

Making more bike-accessible routes is a great thing! I started bicycling as my main form of transportation and in the inner southeast area, this police is pretty well implemented. There are some awesome things like green boxes on the road, and green boxes to enable left turns, bike-accessible crosswalk buttons (plus I learned how to trigger stoplight signals with my bike), there's the bike route arrows which help you stay on bike-safe roads. It's great. I love the ideas of both this and the 'make transportation more accessible and affordable' policy, but I feel like these are already being implemented. The lightrail to Milwaukie is way in the works, the bike roads around the eastside are great. Both of these could use more improvements, I'm sure, but they're great little babes right now.

More cleaning of bike trails and sidewalks to make them pleasant/safe to ride on. More bike/ride options to combine transit options.

More main corridors north south and east and west and complete existing projects.

More ped, less bike investment.

More public bike racks would be welcome. Also, more enforcement of having bicyclists use a head light and tail light. As a driver, it can be very difficult to see a rider in poor weather conditions, and in the dark.

Most new bicycling investment should be on separated bikeways that people can use everyday for commuting and getting to places they need to go, not just for recreation. Sidewalks should be a priority everywhere.

Mostly waking. I think bikes have receive there fair share of funds.

Must begin by building communities where biking and walking are feasible (not like typical low-density suburban communities).
Need to increase density of urban development to make it more convenient to walk and bike places.

No one wants to bike across town. Creating local hubs that people actually want to sit in and be in (piazzas, parks, calm & car free plazas etc) with calm, safe bike connections for the full 8-80 crowd will do more for cycling than green paint and bike lanes. Neighborhood greenways are a great start. For busy routes you will need protected bike lanes (barriers between cars and bikes).

Off street bike paths. Pedestrian safety.

Pedestrians need to be able to cross major thoroughfares at reasonable intervals, even roads like 82nd and McLoughlin, which are designated as highways. Best as I can tell, this means not just investment, but the will to take on ODOT.

Preserving existing neighborhood greenways by making ones that are overused by cars more inaccessible to cars, i.e. installing diverters and other traffic calming measures.

Prioritizing efforts in poorer parts of the region.

Provide more spaces to carry bikes on buses and Max trains during peak commuter times. Make it easy to bike from Sellwood to Lewis & Clark College, and create connected bike lanes on roads around Reed College and Lewis & Clark College.

Safe paths to schools.

Safe, protected, continuous bikeways will encourage more riders. Complete streets needed!

Safety and how to share scarce infrastructure dollars with the dominant transportation, automobiles. Cars are here and not going away.

Safety. Carefully separate bike lanes from vehicular traffic.

See last comment.

Separated bikeways should be pursued more. Part of making biking safer and easier is to make it easier for drivers to avoid bikes.

Serving lower income areas with lower vehicle ownership rates first. East Portland and east county should take precedent over higher income areas. Neighborhood greenways should take precedent over expensive to build trails.

Sidewalks are lacking in lots of places. Look at East Portland.

Sidewalks should be prioritized in areas with lots of traffic and a lot of children and areas with a lot of poverty.

Site lines. Make it so that drivers can see the folks on bikes and walking, especially bikes, as they travel much faster. Some of the site lines are so short that you don't have time to stop. Especially the Spring Water Trail.

Stop reducing auto traffic lanes.

Street lighting, sidewalk amenities.
Strict Liability laws that protect bicyclists and pedestrians. More bike paths that are completely separated from roads. More infrastructure for bikes such as colored bike lanes, traffic signals for bikes, secure bike parking, more ability to combine bikes and transit--bike parking garages as in Amsterdam would be helpful.

Striking a difficult balance, making decision that make sense and aren't (overly) political.

The region should prioritize and completely build our connected walking and bicycling networks before investing in roadways. We still can't get everywhere we want to go by walking or biking, and that impacts our choices as well as our health. We should invest in our active transportation system first, especially for those who rely upon it, such as kids, those using mobility devices, and our ageing population.

There are some great bikeways, but still in order to get from most point "As" to point "Bs" in town, you have to go through difficult intersections with lots of traffic; we should use a rule of thumb of something like "would my parents feel safe riding this route, including at night?" litmus for making true bikeways. When you look at Denmark or cities like Gothenberg, Sweden, it is clear we have a long way to go to improving bike-ability here.

This has to be easy and safe for people, both riders and drivers.

Walking being given same consideration as biking to ensure adequate pedestrian-only routes are available.

We need to figure out ways to make biking efficient and safe. North-south travel across the city is quite difficult because there are no good routes; your choice is slow, on back roads, or dangerous, with cars. Those aren't good choices.

We need to retain our bike city/region position and have lanes separated from the street like New York and others now have. A white line is only for the fearless.

What are the main avenues of bike traffic - N Williams/Vancouver is one I see occasionally along with traffic off the bridges, and I'm sure there are other areas. Focus on separation in these areas (of bikes from motor vehicles). Enforce existing laws with more sting operations at pedestrian crossings (I would recommend NE MLK Jr Blvd & Graham), and enforcement of laws banning hand-held cellphones.

Wherever possible to separate people, either on foot or bikes, from cars.

Yes, I love this idea. I am a bike commuter. I encourage people to bike all the time, but they make excuses like, they're afraid, or that it takes too long, or that they don't like getting to work all sweaty.

Both sides of the Willamette need to be developed with WIDE paths - wide enough to permit bikes, roller skates, pedestrians etc. Ten feet would be better than six. Use the experience of Seattle, and the unfortunately undersized path around Greenlake. Require bicyclists to pay a small license fee.

Build out the bike and pedestrian network first and then work on maintenance.

Existing bike routes are minimal that is workable. Need to keep bike routes clean that is a problem. Need sidewalks for all with wheelchair cuts. Cannot currently transport a friend 4 blocks in his wheelchair without being forced into the street because of lack of corner cuts.
Fessenden/Stlouis needs more pedestrian crossing areas! Especially to the Bus stops!

First: provide sidewalks in flat residential areas that do not have them. This is critical. The state of SE Portland is disgraceful. A distant second: long distance bikeways like the Willamette and Sullivan Gulch. A very distant third: improve active transit in difficult terrain like the SW hills, etc. Not very much benefit for the great cost in those areas.

Gentrification and politics.

Income, demographic, safety and health data.

It would be nice to have more options to bike off the street on bike paths. But first, making all bike paths and sidewalks connect seems like a priority. And making sure all areas have access to these things.

Keeping bicycles off major streets is helpful to cars & bikes.

Local governments have been terrified of making bold choices to improve active transportation options since Sam Adams administration began declining. It’s time to start making big bold changes again and realizing short term complaining from local businesses is almost inevitably replaced by enthusiasm in the long run.

Make biking and walking as safe as possible with routes that aren't necessarily on major roads.

Making stronger boundaries between car traffic and bike traffic, and especially incorporating the "cycle track" concept.

No amount of investment will be effective with an evergrowing population.

Not as high a priority as mass transit but still important.

Not as high a priority as others.

Priority should be given to creating safe, convenient access on all important regional transportation corridors so that biking and walking has the same freedom of available routes & access as motoring. Biking and walking infrastructure should be designed by competent technicians to world-class standards; the region should be a design leader at the national level. Major investments need to be made to improving the shamefully disconnected and poorly designed bike system. Rights-of-way in general should be slowed and redesigned to prioritize safety (with the side benefit of reduced noise pollution).

Route choices; needs to go to useful places.

See previous question.

Separate pedestrians and bicyclists. Increasing the infrastructure for both populations needs to consider that bicyclists are using vehicles that can and have seriously injured pedestrians at worst and frightened them at best.

Sidewalk accessibility and protected bike lanes.

St. Helens Highway is a scary road to ride a bike, having wider bike lanes would be so awesome, it's such an easy ride to town. Otherwise I take the Greeley gauntlet, super scary.

The homeless camps around the walking paths, crime and drug use.
The large numbers of users demands expensive infrastructure. It is time to pay for it.

There should always be sidewalks and clearly marked crossings for both bicycles and pedestrians. Often these are dark and it is hard to see people in the crossings either due to dark clothing or dark bushy environs.

Ways to connect biking with other public transit, ie - being able to take your bike on the MAX and bus (which can be done now but often rack slots on buses are filled or there's an abundance of people on the MAX making it hard to hang the bike). Increase frequency of transit service to remedy.

We need more bike infrastructure and better connections between existing infrastructure.

Again, leave the trees alone.

Ensuring that the biking infrastructure connects. We have lots of pieces of a bike network that just end or have gaps which are barriers to all but the most courageous users. Biking safety should be a priority over car parking.

Make our sidewalks safe for pedestrians, particularly those of age or handicaps #1 get the bikes & skateboards etc off the sidewalks #2 repair the sidewalks

Provided you don't cut down trees and other long-standing greenery as you connect X to Y.

Put in where economical and close the holes in the existing system before spending money on projects in the far edges of the Metro area.

Understanding the limitations of biking as an alternative mode of transportation. It is a lesser form of work or essential errand transportation and pays virtually nothing for use of public right of ways.

Add fully-separated cycle tracks though business districts, not just along side streets where it's politically easier.

Aim bicycle investments at the segment of the possible cycling public that needs to feel more secure and comfortable when riding.

Connectivity of course. Independence from large auto roads.

Create pathways that connect people with community resources that they may need including shopping, recreation, and work.

High crossing and biking areas, streets with large gaps of bike infrastructure.

I am visually impaired and walk a great deal. Our sidewalks in many places are horrible. In many places they do not exist. Curb cuts are not uniform and often do not provide safe access for disabled people. I think we should spend more money on creating good safe sidewalks before we create more bike paths.

Implementing these types of policy will take a huge investment in education. Currently when funding for these types of projects move forward the backlash is loud and vocal. More public education is needed as to why they benefit EVERYONE.

Land use, geography.
Make safer streets for bicycles and motorists... but put a priority on safe pedestrian facilities where there's more than occasional traffic.

More education about where lanes are now - and information on where they will soon be.

Priority to funding walking over bicycles.

Safety of crosswalks, sidewalks. Street lighting for safe walking at night.

Start with the core and work out. Some people have actually chosen intentionally to live in places that are not safe for walking and biking. I would rather spend thousands retrofitting downtown and core area streets than millions on roads in the burbs that take more than a good urban designer's touch to retrofit.

Stop worrying about politics and people panicking about losing parking spaces. Just do something in all sections of the city to improve bike access. Again--don't forget us in the SW. Talk about an underserved area.

1. Create bike-only streets that permit through passage of bikes but allow limit access to automobiles and trucks. Barriers at the end of bike streets would allow bikes to continue while impeding trucks and cars. 2. Ban bikes from main car-bus-truck roads. Bikes should be walked on the sidewalks of these streets. Examples include SE 39th Ave, SE Hawthorne, SE Sandy, NW 21st Ave, SW Broadway. 2. Commercial streets need to have wider sidewalks so that walking is both safe and pleasant.

Do not lump bicycle transportation with walking. You're being disenguous by doing so. Not everyone rides a bike nor drives a car but almost everyone walks!! 2. Portland police do not adequately enforce pedestrian safety laws. 3. Portland declares itself high on the bike commute list of cities but does NOTHING to increase pedestrian safety. The city merely pours more money into light rail and bicycle lanes. Guess what? I've had bicyclists nearly hit me because THEY don't obey traffic laws or heed pedestrian rights-of-way, either!

Access to services/amenities. It doesn't make sense to sacrifice car lanes if biking and walking are not feasible ways to get groceries.

Accommodation for slow cyclists on city bikes will make everyone happier.

Additional biking needs to be balanced with automobiles though. Taking away vehicle travel lanes and converting them to bike lanes (downtown) and justifying it by thinking it will allow more people to bike and less to drive is not the answer. Improved bike and ped facilities are good but not at the expense of degrading vehicle service.

Again, certain parts of town obviously need this more than others.

Already more than enough investments are being being made in the bike realm - it's time to focus more efforts and dollars in other areas.

Better marking and enforcement of pedestrian crosswalks. Prohibition of bikes on busy thoroughfares where good bike routes are immediately parallel (Hawthorne, for example). More aggressive paving and sidewalk installation on streets that lack them now.
Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is a key amenity that differentiates Portland from other communities. We need to continue to make these investments to keep up with growth and combat the huge tolls that traffic congestion has on quality of life. Investment in car infrastructure is ultimately a losing proposition as it only attracts more congestion; investing in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure lead to paradigm shifts that can make the city more sustainable and improve quality of life for people across the socioeconomic spectrum.

Bike lanes are not good enough on busy streets (anything with more than 1 lane in each direction). Protected bike lanes must be the tool of choice here, or your progress will be limited.

Bike lanes on busy roads is not bike infrastructure. We need separated bike paths to get normal folks riding all the time. Like the Netherlands. I moved here for the bike life. Also the Springwater is filled homeless and no cops around. Don't build something you can't support.

Bikeways that are completely removed from traffic; i.e., on Foster Blvd., widening sidewalk to incorporate a bikeway that is off street would be better than having a bike lane that is next to car lanes. At least some protective barrier between cars and bikes will give more people confidence to get out there. Collaborate with employers and universities to come up with incentives for commuters to bike, to provide showers on site, and otherwise help remove people's mental blocks.

Biking and walking will be more popular when the public believes that they will be both safe and convenient. Do not forget to also focus on health benefits.

Cost benefit analysis and serving underserved populations Making crosswalks safe but continue main thoroughfares to be car oriented.

Do not force sidewalks on a neighborhood.

Doing this in more areas of Portland, not just frequently traveled.

Enforce existing laws that keep drivers from using bike lanes as turning lanes or passing lanes. Prevent buses from pulling into bike lanes. Allow bikes to treat stop signs as yield signs. Prevent privately owned vehicles from driving in the core downtown area. Require trucks to have safety equipment in order to prevent cyclists from falling under the trucks. Require delivery vehicles used in town to be smaller. Reduce speed limits to 15 or 20mph on all streets designated as bike routes. Build more dedicated Multi Use Paths. Make getting a driver's license much more difficult. Include more questions on bicycle safety. Also, include reaction tests along with vision tests. Educate the population on the benefits of cycling. Also, educate them on how to drive cars while sharing the roads with cyclists. Add additional traffic calming devices on designated bike routes.
Expansion of bicycle paths and neighborhood 'greenways' to connect more areas of the city through low, volume streets.

More traffic diverters! Speed bumps do very little to discourage cars from using neighborhood greenways as their cut through routes. Drivers have learned that these streets provide fewer stops signs and they completely ignore the reduced speed limits on them. Prevent the cars from using these streets! Local neighbors will still be able to navigate in on adjacent streets, it will take them a few seconds more; however, it will discourage the 'cut through' traffic.

Finding funding and balancing the needs of automobile and freight movement while accommodating bikes. Consider bike routes OFF main arterials.

Have a grid of continuous bikeways (paths and bike boulevards) that cover the whole city that are well signed. Orient business development to the paths.

I believe that active transportation is the most cost effective way to reduce congestion and climate damage. The metro area needs bike infrastructure that runs through vibrant commercial districts, rather than being hidden away on side streets for auto drivers’ convenience. This will make bikes more appealing because the infrastructure actually leads to useful places. Infrastructure gaps should be filled. As a flip side to making walking and biking more convenient, driving should also be made less convenient -- this will result in the largest gains in bike/walk mode share.

I use the Clinton St bike corridor which has become steadily more congested with car traffic over the years. I would say that designated bike routes should actively discourage car traffic by building in impediments like speed bumps every 20 feet. Residents would at most have to deal with 1/2 block of these traffic barriers. Bikes would flow freely and safely.

Make it easier to take bikes on public transit. I like the painted green bike lanes at busy intersections. Tree lined streets to slow auto traffic. Lighted crosswalks (critical for the dark season).

Make safer for seniors to walk when sharing with bikes.

Make short neighborhood trips easier and more accessible through education, mentorship, signage, sharrows, designated neighborhood street bikeways, etc.

Making neighborhoods safer to get around by reducing reliance on private automobile use.

Making sure low-income neighborhoods have sidewalks in high traffic areas.

More bike paths and bike routes, more well marked cross walks at busy intersections to help bikes and pedestrians cross.

More stop signs in SE pdx! Some intersections don’t even have a four-way, it’s just a free for all! Super dangerous for everyone. Chirping walk signals help disabled persons.

Oftentimes, the policies of other agencies responsible for roadway infrastructure (i.e., PDOT, ODOT) are not aligned. Coordination is needed to ensure Metro’s policies can be implemented effectively.

Phase-out auto-centric facilities. Favor dedicated bike/ped facilities.
Please include more areas outside of the central east and west sides. We need bikeways to connect from outer areas to the areas where people want to go. Also need more curb cutouts and sidewalks in neighborhoods.

Portland has a significant problem with bicycle route connectivity, and also with family-friendly bike routes. Most neighborhood greenways I ride see far too much motor vehicle traffic, and I can count on one hand the places where my spouse and I can safely ride side-by-side and have a conversation.

Portland needs more buffered bike lanes and to continue to push the envelope on being a bikable city... "sharrows" on residential streets just isn't cutting it. We need major thoroughfares to be accommodating cyclists as well. Look at what NYC has done!!! Also, educating the hordes of new Portland car drivers to share the road well (not begrudgingly), and it would also be helpful if the street signage at crosswalks was clearer. Some places there are conflicting signals (like at 64th and Foster Rd) and other places a sign with a bike and an arrow does not clearly tell drivers whether just to 'look out for cyclists' or to offer the right of way (like 39th near Laurelhurst park).

Psychological factors in addition to purely logistical ones. Many people (rightly or wrongly) feel unsafe when biking in a small painted lane directly adjacent to fast-moving vehicles. More dedicated/separated paths that take people through large parts of the city/community would go a long way towards increasing ridership, which would help health goals as well in a virtuous cycle. As far as walking, I think we need to focus on density in most neighborhoods. Creating walkable communities, means that things need to be close enough to get to within a reasonable time. The region should prioritize the acquisition and development of properties that add walkable destinations to communities that currently lack them.

Safe from bushy areas with homeless hiding.

Safety.

Safety and minimizing mixing of transportation modes.

Stop shoving bikes and buses onto the edges of the road where they're in direct conflict, while there are still multiple lanes for the cars to whiz by unimpeded. Sometimes it's OKAY to slow the cars in order to put people first.

STOP SPENDING ALL OUR $$ on BIKE LANES!! MAKE OUR STREETS AND SIDEWALKS SAFE FOR PEDESTRIANS, the HIGHEST use of all transportation types! This helps far more people, all of whom can get exercise, take themselves to bus stops, and shop locally. So stop the nonsense of always assuming ONLY BIKES COUNT!!!
That bikes and cars don't mix, especially on major roads. The major roads should be designated as motorized vehicle only (e.g. Powell, Division, 82nd, Burnside, MLK, Grand, Broadway, Sandy, Fremont, etc.) and these roads should have complementary roads that are bike friendly. Major streets within neighborhoods that lead to schools and parks should have sidewalks and curb-cuts for pedestrians. Too many neighborhood streets have a patchwork of sidewalks and curb-cuts which puts pedestrians in the road.

The Springwater corridor has become a homeless camp haven. Please consider how to maintain the integrity of these biking and walking paths.

This is a far more cost-effective strategy than for example building out new rail lines on largely new ROW (to mention something good, but very expensive for the benefit it provides). Many more biking & walking projects should be moved to the "Financially prioritized" (not sure what the exact name is) list on the Transportation Plan. Also - bike-to-transit is a huge unused potential market in the Portland area. Please add lots of that - must include BOTH safe, comfortable infrastructure AND secure parking to get significant mode share. Beaverton TC has secure parking, but bad infrastructure. Portland has no/bad parking, but good infrastructure (at least except for SW and East Portland).

Throw more money at bicycling. Seriously, make it rain! Over the last 20 years in Portland, investments in bicycling have outperformed investments in transit in terms of dollars spent per new commuter by a rate of 40:1. That means it cost 40 times more to get a person out of their car and onto transit that it did to get them out of their car and onto a bike. That isn't to say we shouldn't invest in transit - we should! But bicycling investments are SO INCREDBLY EFFICIENT that we should be spending way, way more money on them than we currently do. There will be diminishing returns eventually, but there's no indication bike investments will be anything but the best transportation bang for the buck for a long time forward.

Together with investing in existing road and bridge maintenance/replacement we should consider making biking and walking safer.

Unhappy car centric drivers who would resent losing their priority status.

We need to begin to look at bikeways that are separate from roads in order to entice more people who aren't cyclists to ride bikes.

Put priority to ensure that bus routes have sidewalks and the areas around them work for people trying to reach transit.

Accidents, crosswalks, foot traffic, bike lanes, speed limits and enforcement for all of the above. Possibly wider sidewalks with bike lanes marked on them (for timid riders).
Adding biking and walking paths and lanes should NOT be done by reducing lanes and routes for vehicular traffic - unless they are truly on extremely light traffic count streets in already fully developed areas. Perhaps it may also be worth considering sky bridge bike paths, where for example there would be an elevated bike path (30' above street level) that follows the middle of a street with elevators or off ramps about every six blocks, on a few strategic streets that don't currently have good bike or walking access. Maybe one along Burnside going from 28th East Burnside to 23rd West Burnside. Think of it sort of like New York's high-line park system. Perhaps another one could be on either SE Division or Hawthorne from I-205 connecting to the East Bank Esplanade.

Better lighting for walking, more bike paths.

Bike lane transitions & intersection safety for children walking or riding (visibility).

Bike lanes, sidewalk connectivity, pedestrian timed traffic signals.

Biking / walking is still high risk; we need to make this a priority in transportation; bike access in PDX is only a token & remains difficult.

Clear signage is needed, clear right of way for bikes and pedestrians important.

Consider tradeoffs between biking and mass transit, to verify whether the costs of bike lanes are worth the investment, considering environmental and social costs, when compared with mass transit.

Continue and increase development of facilities that provide comfort and safety to bicycles.

Don't bring traffic to a halt, build walking bridges tunnels etc.

Equity.

Except for freeways all routes should be walking and biking accessible via designated or separated bike lanes and side walks present and in good condition.

I support more dedicated bike paths, but NOT by replacing lanes of vehicular traffic. For streets that have bike lanes, I'd like to see more of them switched to the way they have them near PSU where the bike lane is closest to the sidewalk, and then there's a car parking area that separates the bike lane from the vehicular lanes.

Keep bicyclists off of sidewalks. We pay for bike lanes, make bicyclists use them. Pay more attention to needs of pedestrians for a change. Too much attention given to cars and bikes, not enough to people who walk.

Return on investment and equity are both important. Investment in places that affect the most people should be a priority.

Safety -- from traffic, good lighting, etc.

Safety involves more than just avoiding traffic accidents. People need to feel that they can walk unaccosted.

Safety, cost.
Sometimes on busy streets, crosswalks get closed so heavy turn traffic can occur by automobiles. This really discourages pedestrians and makes them go out of direction, adds more time, etc. Give pedestrians just as much right of way as cars, even on very busy streets.

Bikes need to be licensed. Fees would go directly to safe bike lanes. Pedestrian safety should not be sacrificed because bikers choose to use sidewalks because biking on many streets is hazardous.

Consider reducing automobile-based infrastructure (parking, travel lanes, wide intersections, etc.) in favor of increasing active transportation infrastructure (lit crossings, removing parking in favor of bike lanes, reducing car connectivity in neighborhoods while increasing walking/biking/transit connectivity, etc.).

Creating bike and pedestrian corridors away from high traffic areas. Walking and bicycling on busy streets is really unpleasant and not safe. Portland is progressing quite well with this.

Don't give biking too much priority on heavily driven routes, they can be routed to next streets over. Sidewalks for walking.

Encouraging biking and walking should be the top transportation priority for the Climate Smart Communities project. These modes of transportation are zero-emission, they are good for the environment, public health, the economy, and livable communities. The return on investment is also very high. Additionally, the more people cycle, the safer the roads are for all users.

Get serious about separate and/or elevated bikeways so almost anyone can get around by bike, rather then just young, fit bike nuts. As much as bikes are cool, you are NEVER going to get many people using bikes for everyday transportation if they have to ride mostly with cars.

I don't commute by bike partly because I'm scared of riding with traffic. Several people I know who bike commute have been hit by a car at one point. Bike lanes that are separated from car lanes by parked cars or planters or some other solid object feel safer than painted lanes.

I have reservations about the extension of biking without policies for making riders more responsible. As a walker, about 4 miles a day, I find that bikers are often more dangerous than cars. The need for rules and regulations and appropriate enforcement must be part of this. The same is true with cars. It is easy to talk a good game but not develop and enforce one. Streets need to be marked, drivers need to be informed and where necessary penalized, and walkers need to know their rule of the road.

Keep bicycles and pedestrians separate so pedestrians have a safe way to get around.

Look at communities such as New York City, where very innovative designs for things like protected bike lanes in conjunction with pocket lanes for turning cars are being done. Separate bikes from pedestrians in high-traffic areas, as is being done on the Hawthorne Bridge. And more, perhaps folding, bike hooks on the MAX trains!

Making these modes of transportation a priority over driving and parking for the average citizen.
More attention to crossing arterials more attention to walkways on farm to market roads more attention to neighborhood cut-throughs.

Move bike lanes from major traffic streets to adjacent streets when possible. For example, in Northwest Portland, use Savid instead of Therman/Vaughn or Flanders instead of Everett. Putting bikes on major streets slows traffic and increases car/bicycle conflict.

Need more dedicated bikeways in order for inexperienced cyclists to feel safe.

Safety.

Study accident reports involving pedestrians and cyclists and figure out how those accidents could have been avoided by making the areas where they occurred safer.

This should be our top priority not just in this project but in all transportation decisions. 4+ lanes makes it really hard for a road to be safe/convenient for biking and walking. More protected crossings and bike lanes are needed- not just paint.

Too often new things such as green lights for bikes only, bike lanes on left side of street. Bike boxes are simply concepts and when applied are dangerous. Too these seen to be done more for making Portland platinum rather than something safe and that works. A bike lane should never, never have any parking. I say this having been hit in a bike box and doored twice.

Walker safety in crosswalks at intersections. walkers are invisible to car drivers, I do not like being in the middle of the crosswalk with a car blowing through the intersection and the crosswalk I am using.

Work harder on overcoming high speed arterial road barriers to pedestrian and biking safety, such as w. Burnside at 23 rd, Everett/ Glisan coupling at 405, the mess at sw 6 th, broadway, terwilliger. Also change red light frequency on Burnside to be more pedestrian friendly.

A larger safety zone between bikers and cars.

A lot has already been done, but some corners have been cut. Having 1-2 blocks with a bike route does not a bike route make.

Adding more major bike routes that aren't along very busy roads.

Adopt a design standard policy that dictates the type of cycling facility that must be built given the volume and speed of the adjacent road. Painted bike lanes on the side of a major road with > 35mph speed limits do not serve the vast majority of citizens. Cycling is most competitive on trips of 2-3miles. Focus on making safety improvements/connections that make cycling safe and convenient for trips from employment, commercial and transit hubs to nearby neighborhoods.

Affordable transit oriented development; affordable housing in places where residents can access quality, high frequency, convenient (covered) transit.
Again, the main reason that more Americans don't bike is not that they're lazy, it's that it's perceived as unsafe. More bike boulevards, and publicizing the ones we have, more separated bike lanes (with curb protection), more off-road bike and pedestrian paths, more bridges or ways to cross busy streets - all of these would make a difference.

All safe walking does not have to be on sidewalks... More comfortable and attractice walking paths would be great - just keeping people out of the street.

Assure that sidewalks are in all residential neighborhoods, particularly SE.

Better lighting on sidewalks. Educating bikers on safer riding!! There are too many bikers that ride the street and sidewalk, both freely to suit their easier access. Makes it dangerous for pedestrians and cars alike, since you don't know where they will jet off to next. Maybe ticket unsafe bikers!

better lighting, easy on the feet surfaces.

Bike lanes, bike boulevards are so critical. Downtown Portland is pretty scary relative to the neighborhood greenways. We really need to get more north-south boulevards going across the highways and near downtown.

Bike routes located on busy streets (e.g., Vancouver and Williams) no longer feel very safe. Massive real estate development along these already trafficky routes has now rendered them unusable for me. A better solution would be to start having bike-only streets. For example, make Vancouver bike only and reserve Williams for motorized traffic in both directions (or vice versa).

Biking and transit are - by far - the most cost-effective tools for reducing transportation-related air and climate pollution.

Biking and walking to transit is important.

Biking is the cleanest, healthiest, and a very social way of transport, but is given no priority in right of way or policy. Please give us safe separated bike routes on arterials and trails. Bikes are just treated as a toy and walking is an afterthought, but these activities build the transport social fabric of our city.

Consider that most bicyclists also own cars and thus pay a considerable amount in taxes towards transportation infrastructure.

Consider vehicular cycling over recreational cycling when building infrastructure -- how can we make cycling fast & convenient between any 2 points in the city. How can we prioritize cycling traffic? Timing lights on major bike corridors like Williams / Vancouver, & Hawthorne or Broadway bridges to cycling speeds rather than auto speeds.

Continue to give people nearby things to walk/ride to.

Cyclist / pedestrian education. The onus for safe conduct should be on the side facing gravest incidence of injury / death.
Dedicated paths; wider and better marked paths when shared with other modes of transportation; better signage and lighting.

Direct cars to main highways and make it difficult for them to consider other routes. Williams St is a good example of this - try to get folks to move over to MLK. New policies such as what's described in 10/16 Portland Tribune about fixing up 82nd is a good way to create nodes of commercial development.

Encourage stronger enforcement against those who endanger vulnerable road users to therefore make potential walkers & riders feel more safe.

Energy efficient street lighting, more separation of cars from biking and walking.

Enhancing bikes/peds requires reducing cars. Not everyone can bike/walk to where they need to go, so must improve transit.

Equity. I just drove down cully this evening, no sidewalks and thete were people walking in the street. Really? Where r the sidewalks. A busy, urban ,connector street and no sidewalk.

Expanding existing bicycle networks and building new ones that separate bicycles from cars as much as possible.

Focus on under-served places in the region where bike and ped networks are sorely lacking. Also, in areas with decent or some bike and ped. infrastructure, require (yes, require) local governments to include and implement connectivity policies in Comp Plan/Transportation System Plan updates and clearly show how improvements to bike/ped. infrastructure will be funded in the next 5 to 10 years. Do not let local governments continue to defray these projects and show funding out 20+ years. More conservative suburbs will never create connected walk and bike access, unless mandated, due to lack of political support for anything beyond paving roads and loud NIMBYs who are scared of having walking paths or sidewalks near their houses or business owners who are worried that losing street parking means loss of business. People shop on foot, bike, and transit, too!

How to make cycling/walking more accessible for more people in more circumstances. In particular, help people feel safe on the roads.

How to maximize bike safety in travelling through the city. Bike avenues with fewer stop signs and bike lanes are great solutions.

I am a daily bike commuter, but I find many of the "improvements" to be unnecessary, and sometimes downright confusing. I typically avoid any marked bike routes to avoid this. There's got to be a better way to spend money than this! (But, I don't know what it is)

I appreciate the alternate roads approach to the busy streets. I live off MLK and our street recently got a few stop signs and a 'sharrow' which is great for slowing the traffic and making it safer for our kids, not just the cyclists.
I do believe we should continue to make walking more safe where sidewalks are still missing. I think biking has been addressed adequately already. How about paving side streets that still require such instead. Including redoing bike waiting areas at lights.

Inducement and enticement to people to use biking and walking as transit as much as possible. Input from active cyclists very important. They know what is working and what isn't working.

It would be so great to have bike (& walking) paths that are NOT on roadways. It would be safer not to associate with autos, it would be healthier to not breathe their exhaust & it would be a more beautiful, pleasing experience. and connecting them! I once followed bike paths & ended up in a totally different place than I thought I was going: something didn't match up.

More protected bike paths, more visibility of bikers and walkers for cars. Need more Physical barriers to protect bycyclist. Neighborhood streets should be designed to induce 10-15mph 85% speeds, so that children can roam the neighborhood without danger to life and limb. Pedestrian & cyclist separate from vehicular traffic.

Prioritize completing missing links in off-road bike paths (e.g., North Portland Greenway, 40-mile loop), building planned paths sooner (e.g. Sullivan's Gulch trail), adding vitally needed connectors (e.g., bike/ped bridge at NE 7th Ave. over I-84). Also, prioritize dramatically expanding *buffered* bike lanes--and don't use easily damaged plastic bollards for buffering, follow the lead of other cities and use hard infrastructure. Need to prioritize *increased funding* for bike/ped projects.

Prioritize fixing up roads which are heavily used by bikes but not much by cars. (like ne holman). bikes are much more susceptible to gravel and potholes than cars. Protect greenways by adding more diverters. More protected bikeways. More road diets. Protected bike lanes would go a long way in encouraging biking. Protected bike lanes. Diverters on Greenways. Engineer good behavior from drivers. Require sidewalks be free of overgrowth. Pave bikeways so that they are smooth. SAFE access for biking and walking! Right now, there is not a bike network, just unconnected segments of infrastructure that are not safe for all riders. Walking is super dangerous too, no one pays any attention to marked or unmarked crosswalks, especially the police. Start with PPB respecting crosswalk laws and others may take it serious too.

Safety, collaboration with systems like google maps to make route finding easy and reliable-- without something like that I would never bike on a day in which I had an out of office/neighborhood meeting. School area bike and pedestrian safety, via cross walks, lights, bike lanes, adequate bike parking at schools. More bike paths that are not shared with cars. More bike Boulevards. Discounted safety equipment for children: lights, helmets etc.
Separating bicycle traffic from automobile traffic as much as possible. Reducing the number of stops for traffic control devices that cyclists have to make. Using traffic signals instead of stop signs for bike traffic so that cyclists understand and follow traffic laws.

Sidewalks and connectivity.

Slow down traffic on green ways to 10mph.

Some thought ought to be given to licensing cyclists. Cyclists without proper lights on bikes ought to fined. Also, I often think it would be good to ban bikes from narrow streets that are much used by cars and trucks and have no bike lanes. Three such streets I am very familiar with are NE 33rd, NE Killingsworth and NE 15th. Perhaps along with banning bikes on some streets, other streets could be made for bikes only or could be improved so bikes and motorized vehicles could safely co-exist. Secondly, not all densely populated parts of the Metro area including Portland have sidewalks and that’s a real safety issue for pedestrians. With property taxes being what they are, citizens should not have to pay for sidewalks in their neighborhoods.

Spend money on this but don’t waste money- like painting the bike lanes green with inferior paint, etc. Biking and walking is already generally safer here than in other communities so put more money into reducing transit fares or incentivizing people to not have or use cars.

The facilities for walking and biking need to be adequately maintained, not built and forgotten.

The health benefits of increasing walking and bicycling; the education benefits of children arriving at school ready to learn (i.e., with some exercise to start their day); the productivity benefits of employees arriving at work after physical activity; the economic benefits of reduced demand for vehicle parking.

There needs to be designated cross city streets for bicycle commuting, like a bike highway to get across town, with limited stops, parking for residents only.

Vulnerable road users should be protected and making these improvements to the areas with the most need, that have the furthest to go to get to healthy, connected communities.

We need more separated facilities to keep people safe. more sidewalks, protected bikelanes, pedestrian refuge islands, etc.

We need to more better utilize the facilities we have too. Our current network is under utilized.

We should heavily invest our time and resources into immediately funding the 2030 bicycle master plan. We should find motor vehicle users guilty in every collision with a person walking or biking. We should build out an extensive separated bicycle infrastructure on all of our major commercial corridors. We should put as many roads on road diets as we can, limit lanes and limit free on street parking.

Will the facilities that result from these investments be primarily dedicated to bicycles and/or pedestrians? If neighborhood greenways, are sufficient diverters proposed to keep the improvements from attracting additional autos to the facility? Does the facility in question contribute to building a more complete and/or safer and/or more comfortable regional bicycle/pedestrian network?
"Increases access to jobs and services" This is Metro-speak. Walking and biking does not increase access to jobs. It just means getting to a job by different means. People have been walking and biking to jobs for years. See previous comment. Not everyone has the luxury of time to rollerblade to work. Nor are they physically capable. Striking a balance between all forms of transportation is the key to good policy -- not building infrastructure based on the demands of a small minority. Portland is not Amsterdam and never will be.

Adding people in wheelchairs to the list of making biking and waking safe and convenient. What percentage of people in Portland use wheelchairs? From looking around it seems like a lot yet they are never mentioned when alternative methods of transportation are discussed. There are a lot of Boomers coming down the pike who would like safe and convenient access too.

Be sure to remember that cyclists and walkers frequently are also automobile drivers. Please do not sacrifice one mode of transportation for another. An example that does not seem to be working is the narrowing of Vancouver and Williams. I am a cyclist, walker and driver and those two roads are now miserable to all involved.

Better safety near schools. I see cars block the crosswalks at NE 33rd and US Grant daily.

Bicycling investments currently have the highest return on investment for any projects that we can make because of the historical lack of funding there.

Bike safety- need to make it appealing to more people.

Connecting low stress networks.

Consider grade separation of bike lanes from cars (like in Europe), not just paving stripes. Public information program for all cyclists to wear helmets, lights, bright clothing (I'm a cyclist).

Creating safe ways for more individuals and families to walk and bike but not forcing the issue by building big apartment buildings or stores with very limited or no parking. That just increases congestion and diminishes safety (I'm thinking of New Seasons stores and apartments on N. Williams and NE Broadway). How do we balance density with the ability of people to get around (cars, transit, walking, biking)?

Cycle routes are fine, but after they are installed, maintain them - get the pavement up to standard and keep the routes clean.

Emulating success of NE Klickitat bike route design.

Existing bike lanes that can be expanded/connected to other existing one, or to new ones. Continue to make the heaviest used bike streets main bike thoroughfares with enough width for bikes to pass each other safely and cars to be far enough away.

Focus on under served areas (East Portland, Gresham, etc.) Plan for easy, friendly, hybrid options (walking/biking combined with mass transit. Look for ways to come closer to car commute times with these options. Currently it often takes 2-3 times longer to commute to/from the suburbs using mass transit rather than car. Most people can't afford the time.
Future demand, not current demand.

I am a big fan of dedicated bike lanes and, for shared use spaces, demarcated bike and pedestrian lanes. In addition to improving safety and accessibility of bikeways and walkways for commuting, I think Oregon has the potential to make itself a major destination for bicycle touring if it invests in better infrastructure for this throughout the state. Look for win-win business partnerships.

I like what you've done with biking and sidewalks, however, we need more community education and more practical investment. Four comments: 1. I am an avid biker, have been all my life. I am an aggressive, strong rider but am also aware and courteous of cars and pedestrians. Simple things like allowing the car behind me to make a right turn on a red light rather than blocking them. Giving space for cars to pass when possible, riding on bike streets etc... I find the cars much more courteous toward bikers than I do bikers toward cars. 2. Sidewalk "handicap" access. It's gone overboard. I don't know what we've spent on it but every sidewalk doesn't need a cut. 3. Development. It appears, though I don't have all the facts, that our urban density initiatives have gone way too far. The development on 33rd and NE Broadway is an example. It is hard to believe that the developer wasn't required to widen Broadway and provide for an eastbound turn lane onto 33rd South, that there isn't no landscape set back on Broadway, that some 33rd bridge enhancements weren't required. It's unfathomable what the city allowed there. There are many examples of such developments around town. 4. People are still going to drive cars and need to park them. It's gross what is happening to our streets in the name of density and increasing property tax.

I love walking and biking, but would not want these things added to the detriment of drivers. Not all of us can bike or walk all the time. We are a one car family with a four and two year old and do a lot of walking. But there are times with the young kids that only the car will do.

In order to meet climate goals we need more people on bikes and on foot for more trips. Creating dense neighborhoods is part of it, but creating better and safer infrastructure is important as well. We need to allocate more money towards pedestrian and cycling facilities and as little as possible towards auto-centric projects (unless the net result is improved safety for active transportation).

In the transition to a post-combustion engine economy, drivers will be unhappy (I know, I have to drive a lot). Rip the bandaid off...better to get this inevitable transitional pain over with sooner than later. The holistic costs of driving will only get worse so the sooner and more thoroughly we build alternatives, the better.

Include public information to let drivers know they are to stop at all intersections for pedestrians.

Increased property values as Portland’s quality of life drives increased real estate demand.

Invest according to each community - based on how the live and work within their community. Encouragement of safe neighborhoods, particularly in high traffic corridors/walking, biking to schools.

Investments in low-income communities and regions of new, rapid growth (like East Portland/Multnomah County) should be prioritized.

Lighting is an important component to making sidewalks and biking paths safe.
Longer timed crosswalks at intersections. More crosswalks and put in a system that forces the drivers to see that the crosswalk is there and in use.

Make it easier to get around without a car.

Make sure sidewalks are accessible to transit locations. Bicycle routes should be safe and well delineated.

Making getting around by whatever means (walking, biking, driving, public transit) safer and more efficient is a benefit to everyone, so do not consider special taxes, e.g., bike licenses. Portland is predicted to grow by 500,000 to 700,000 over the next 20 years, so include that in the planning. Where will they live, where will they work, etc. People will folks to those areas that have good public transit and options like bike and walkways for getting around. Building neighborhoods where people don't have to commute but a short distance would be great.

Making physical activity easy and safe for everyone.

More attention should be paid to other cities' successful methods - Portland officials & planners often care too much about being in the vanguard and not enough about actual efficacy.

More marked crosswalks, with any kind of signal device that will alert drivers to the presence of pedestrians.

Not until bikers are willing to pay for their own infrastructure, like autos do. (A popular delusion is that motorists don't pay their own way, but actually they pay OVER 100% of their actual costs.)

One way streets, two-lane bike lanes that are wider to allow for safe passing.

Opening up more dedicated bike boulevards that provide routes that connect all parts of the metropolitan area. In terms of walking, please consider adding sidewalks and lighting in those neighborhoods that have historically lacked them (like Cully and the areas east of 82nd Ave.).

Pedestrian-only sidewalks in areas which do not have them is a must. Bicycle "bumps" in neighborhoods are a waste of money when posted speeds are already 20-25 mph.

Please make it safe for me to ride my bike with my two kids. I drop them off at day care by bike but I don't always feel safe doing so. Please invest in better bike infrastructure.

Publicizing the law that pedestrians have the right of way at ALL corners whether marked or not.

Remember that is not just young people who are willing to bike and walk rather than ride in a car.

Resist the strong desire to reduce traffic congestion by expanding automobile roadways. Instead focus the transportation money on independent bikeways (a la Holland), pedestrian walkways and ways to safely cross traffic.

Safe and easy to use sidewalks for elders and children.

Safety is number one. Find ways to encourage kids to walk or bike to school. Watch out for spending money on bicycle amenities that mostly benefit the middle class.


See previous comment.
Separate by a curb many of the bike lanes from traffic - some places are very unsafe for all.

Separated bikeways should be a priority to allow more people to feel safe about a great way to travel around. Good signage is key.

Signaled and marked crossing on busy streets such as NE 15th ave. Mandatory helmets for all bicyclists. Also mandatory night lights. Also enforce bike riding laws. More public information to make cyclists obey laws and not buzz pedestrians. (I am a safe cyclist)

Sometimes it takes very small amounts of money to make a noticeable impact on safely and convenience. Such as giving the bike ways right of way (instead of stopping every other block).

Sparing no expense to make walking and cycling attractive and implementing these measures to ensure increased walking and cycling will be sustained.

Spread out the investment to be sure historically under served areas get more projects.

Stop allowing cars to take over bicycle streets.

Stop focusing on inner Portland, and help out the outer east side.

The greatest obstacle to people biking is their fear about safety. We need more off-street bike paths and streets dedicated to bikes and pedestrians. Painting a line on the pavement is not good enough. The only way to meet carbon emission goals is to get more people on bikes and walking, safely. I bike on the streets a lot, but many people I know don't because of safety concerns.

The most flexible approach should be taken here. Reduce the inflexible design specs and standards to get more for less. We do not have to build to the 'nuclear threat level' that was called for in the 50s.

The overwhelming numbers of cars within the city. Drivers tend to focus solely on the other vehicles on the road and getting to their destination, not the pedestrians or cyclists.

The primary consideration should be the safe and healthy movement of an ever-increasing number of people within a finite built physical environment. Toward that end, disinsenting unsustainable transport habits and incenting sustainable ones should be primary strategies.

There should be a sidewalk on both sides of every street.

This is a huge part of what I love about Portland.

This is a priority for me when considering the impact on the environment and the cost effectiveness of these investments. As a family and in my workplace, we walk and bike quite a bit each day.
This is a 'yes, but' for me - yes to increased connections that allow people choices in how they move around the city. But, done in a way that improves safety and works to get people to obey a common set of rules for transit - in just this past week I've observed four separate instances of bikers blowing through 4-way stops and it's only due to the hyper-vigilance of some drivers that there wasn't an accident. I've also seen a pedestrian so busy with texting that she walked into an intersection against the light. And I've seen drivers cut of bikers and pedestrians. As much as there is need for infrastructure, there is need for a new social contract on how we all interact with one another.

To implement truly safe and convenient biking infrastructure, it may have to impact people choosing to drive. This should not be considered an impediment to introducing biking infrastructure.

Track the effectiveness of investment in terms of increased % and number of bike and ped trips. Prioritize type and location of investments that produce the best response.

Traffic volume should be considered, especially if considering a multi-use (bike and pedestrian) pathways. With the increase in bike traffic in the metro area, high-volume multi-use paths become overcrowded - and dangerous. A great example is Waterfront Park, which, during the summer, is almost impossible to navigate on a bike due to the number of pedestrians. But the next best option is Naito, which does not allow bikes to pass one another during peak traffic hours.

View other successful cycling cities. How about putting a rumble strip in difficult areas, like when motorists encroach on the bike lane to make a right turn?

Walking and biking is good and I bike to work, but it doesn't solve all problems. People have cars, they drive. More bikes paths aren't going to get someone from Hillsboro to bike into Portland for work.

Walking and biking should be reliable modes of transit to schools first and foremost. Secondarily both should be reasonable solutions for reaching basic services such as food sources.

We need to encourage and support more biking and walking for reasons related to both climate change and physical activity to improve the health of the American public.

We've rested too long on our laurels as bike-friendly in this region. Bike infrastructure is lacking - we need more protected bike lanes in direct routes, even if it means building additional infrastructure. Bikes riding next to cars isn't always the best or safest.
When making changes to established transit modes and resources, THOROUGHLY think about the impact on ALL transit users. Ex: allowing auto traffic to return to, but only use a single lane of 5th & 6th ave downtown was a disaster. Should have just kept cars off. We were used to that! Now you still can't use those streets because you can't turn onto half the streets anyway! you end up circling numerous extra blocks just to get where you want to go. AND: change downtown intersections to two green-light cycles: one for vehicles, and a separate one for pedestrians & bikes. With all the one-ways downtown, an entire lane of cars gets locked at a green light while a pedestrian strolls leisurely across the crossing street and the lead car can't turn! Also: Allow pedestrians to cross diagonally since they are using their own light. Keeps all cars out of the intersection and visa versa when the car's turn, and eliminates one entire light cycle wait for peds needing to cross two streets. Works great in other cities!

Active mode designs like crosswalks and bike striping should be a routine part of every road maintenance project.

Adding bicycle facilities to the streets that serve people’s destinations (i.e. commercial and retail corridors) is essential to achieving this goal. It is not sufficient to relegate people on bikes to using wandering side street routes to do not connect to the front door of where people want to go.

Bike paths should be focused on side streets, not major thoroughfares. In fact, bikes should be discouraged from using major thoroughfares which have less than two traffic lanes in both directions. Sidewalks should be installed on all blocks to encourage walking.

Biking and walking infrastructure should be the number one priority for investment.

Biking seems to have had about the proper emphasis. Need more emphasis on walking options. Locate developments with walking safely and conveniently having a higher priority.

Busy intersections, such as NE 47th and Sandy, are designed in such a way that it's easy for motorists to overlook pedestrians because they're looking for oncoming traffic. Better design for safety is a must.

Childrens needs.

Connectivity. There may be need to invest in expensive projects to provide safe connections between segments of bike or pedestrian routes. The benefits of an expensive but effective connection can benefit the entire network.

Equity in selecting locations.

Focus efforts on completing sidewalk networks. Consider ways to more cost effectively implement sidewalk projects. Construct separated bike facilities that are safe for all users.

Focus on pedestrians over bicyclists.

Getting to a 20% bicycle mode share, protected bike lanes on busier streets.

Go for it! More affordable housing in areas that are already walkable and close-in.

Goes right with improvements in the public transit system.
I think drivers would support this more if there was an educational campaign that encouraged more bikers to wear clothing other than all black and to not use cell phones while biking. Also in the same info campaign, while I don't expect bikers to come to a complete stop at traffic signals I do expect them to at least slow down and turn their heads toward vehicles, so that I as a driver know what they are going to do, and that they are willing to do their part to make a comprehensive traffic plan work for everyone.

I think the city should consider managing and maintaining a fleet of "borrow it" bikes with similar to zip car, with card lock facilities in places around downtown and close in neighborhoods, to encourage short distance biking in Portland.

It's time to follow the lead of other major cities like New-York, Chicago, and Seattle, and move beyond the 5-foot minimum standard bike lane, and invest in wider, protected facilities such as cycletracks and buffered lanes.

Keep creating dense, mixed use areas. It is huge that I can bike to nearby groceries, libraries, medical, restaurants, parks, etc. The more we have these areas throughout the metro region, the more people everywhere can bike, not just those of us on the east side.

Lighting and landscaping to improve safety.

Lighting -Leaf removal in bike lanes -Education- recently a few of the bike lanes that I use have been moved to the left side of the street and I am unsure about turning in/out of the left side from the right.

Make certain that undeserved communities also benefit from these infrastructure improvements.

Make it a top priority. Encourage bike and pedestrian corridors in places with cleaner air. As an asthmatic (who is also car-free), I find it physically challenging to bike around a lot of cars--my lungs can't handle it. And we know that low-income neighborhoods have higher asthma rates. Plan for active asthmatics!

Make some streets for walking or bikes only. Make more trailways to places - like the rail line idea.

More crosswalks, protected islands and traffic calming measures. Parklets are great.

Multi-use paths are desperately needed.

Same input as question 1. As a bike commuter, I see places where existing bike lanes stop, and I have to move carefully to the next marked bike lane. We need to connect these into a more seamless system.

Sidewalks and curbs everywhere in the city.

The needs of all current and trending age groups (kids, seniors, commuters, etc.), not just the most vocal.

This can't be accomplished without also making it less convenient to drive.

This is very important. More sidewalks and bike paths in good repair are needed!

Traffic light cameras like the ones in Fairview. Make bike owners share the burden in future improvements.

Traffic patterns. Some intersections are not safe because the auto traffic is not focused on pedestrians.

Twenty minute neighborhoods everywhere.
Undeserved communities, green spaces, an ethics of care for bikes over cars on shared roads, bike routes that efficiently get from a to b.

We have a great bike infrastructure, but it could be vastly improved for a fraction of the cost of building new roads. I would love to see protected bike corridors and more bike boxes and mechanisms to deter drivers from using bike boulevards.

We have invested a lot in bike access in the Metro area recently. Walking needs to be equally prioritized.

Yes, and lower taxes too.

Absolutely - biking and walking are the smartest investments we can make. Period. Invest in bikes and you get multiple benefits - health, fitness, happiness, less congestion, less air pollution, fewer greenhouse gas emissions, better connections among neighbors, safety, and better use of our public dollars.

Active transportation should be a top priority. It is essential for livable neighborhoods.

Bicyclists should help pay for extra bike lanes.

Bikers should be licensed and expected to follow the rules.

Both bike and walking paths need to be away from traffic. i.e. there needs some sort of protective barrier (not just a line on the pavement) to protect bikers and walkers.

Connecting walking/biking infrastructure networks in a way that makes sense and is safe!

Connectivity and continuity really matter, one short gap of no sidewalk, or on short stretch with dangerous bike passage can defeat use of a long stretch of trail, and once the stuff gets built it must be maintained not ignored.

Consider side streets as better alternatives for bike lanes than on major streets, this way bikes compete less with traffic. Also, making ALL neighborhoods more walkable by adding sidewalks and crosswalks. Focus closer to schools first.

Convert the peripheral areas of Portland to pedestrian / bike friendly urban design with landscaping, bike lanes, low traffic speeds (25 MPH max).

Create a dense network for bicycling, complete sidewalks, providing protected separation from cars, make it easy for kids to walk and bike to school, make it easy for old people to walk, ride bikes and get to the bus.

Cycling and walking routes should be created that are appealing to people who may be uncomfortable riding or walking near busy streets and intersections.

Especially walking - everyone does it and it is healthy.

Filling in gaps in existing trail network should be a priority.

First focus on pedestrian crossing and other safety improvements on busy multi-lane arterial streets, including vehicle speed reduction and illumination, then on implementing the regional active transportation plan. Supplement roadway improvements with education and enforcement efforts. Prioritize based on presence of risk factors, not just past crash data.
Good connections on neighborhood bikeways and bike lanes on bigger roads. Sidewalks in all residential areas.

I support the investment in walking safety. I don't use a bike so this isn't very important to me, but it is needed if this mode is to increase.

I especially support more safe walking areas along busy streets and in outlying areas. Areas with children should be a priority for good sidewalks.

I think a public education campaign to let drivers know that bikes have a place on the road too would help reduce confusion about how to share the road with cyclists. There are so many people relocating from other areas that have less bike activity and infrastructure. I also think cyclotrails or separated bikeways help reduce this confusion.

Ignore the haters and stand up and do the right thing. Portland is no longer #1 bike city - bring it back!

I'm carfree and a year-round bike commuter (though I did have a zipcar account too). It seems that neighborhoods further East are sorely lacking in both pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. I'm almost certain I'd rather see all growing neighborhoods have sidewalks and maybe some bike lane in busy areas (esp.for legal protection as "vulnerable class of traffic"), than have more bioswales in the urban core.

It seems that not all cross walks and bike paths increase overall safety. Increasing common sense would be beneficial in addition to new infrastructure. Don't over emphasize convenience. There are too many cross walks along Hawthorne and too many max stops within downtown.

Keep it simple - not bike share, but bike lanes. Learn from some of the downtown Portland experiments. I don't see many riders on the dedicated lanes on Oak and Stark nor on the Morrison bridge lanes because the route access is lousy. Isolated pieces don't work.

Keeping in mind that bikes share the road with vehicles but aren't the same as vehicles.

Making connections between already existing routes where there are gaps. Re. walkers, considering natural human inclinations, i.e., walking at angles, not having to cross the street and then back again to complete a route, etc.

More grade-separated bike paths. Pedestrian priority should be to/from transit stops.

Need to analyse residential housing patterns on a regional level. Coordinate this policy with public investment. Strategy to increase affordable housing by protected class status and income.

No new taxes or fees for consumers or businesses.

Not only sidewalks and bike paths, but we should have walk- and bike-only streets and networks of high speed (20mph) bikeways. We need revolutionary investment in these modes, not more of the same.

Of course I support but for what goals? Again the issue needs focus. Are you trying to increase active transportation to work, for daily errands, or for pleasure?
Oops, see my previous reply. Also, adding more left turn lights on the north/south streets where they intersect Burnside would make that street much safer (such as 28th and 20th).

Prioritize improving existing bike/walking routes; expand on these where needed to create a better network. Ex: At the west end of the Hawthorne Bridge (which is wonderfully marked), bikes are suddenly dumped onto city streets with no bike lanes.

Prioritizing safe walking and biking over car speeds and street parking.

Protected bikeways (not just paint) - enforce speed limits on neighborhood greenways - add diverters to neighborhood greenways so cars don't use as mini arterials.

Public investment and subsidy for ped and bike infrastructure should go to communities/neighborhoods of "modest means" first.

Safe crossings for bike lanes across highways and major 4-6 lane roads.

Safety education for drivers, walkers, and bikers. As active transportation becomes more popular everyone should be informed and follow the rules of the road.

Safety in turning and crossing lanes. Keeping bike lanes well maintained, especially in winter when that's where the "muck" ends up. I would love more bike and pedestrian-only zones.

Safety is the key. Separated bike & walk lanes are great, even if (especially if) they require removal of an automotive lane.

Safety. Safety. Safety. Transportation priorities should be, in order of spending and priorities: walking, biking freight, transit, driving.

See prior comment.

Separated bike infrastructure most important. Enhance ease of getting from a to b, motorized traffic must vacate greenways.

Support for small shopping areas in the community that are easy to walk to.

The bike boulevards aren't well lit enough: my son was struck again last night.

The green bike boxes are great. I'd love to see the Hawthorne bridge bike/pedestrian sidewalks expanded -- maybe even separated so bikes can move faster without putting peds at risk.

The top priority in my mind is making systems safer for bikers.

There are too many neighborhoods without sidewalks and that is a problem. I do not think there needs to be more bike paths.

There should be an education component for cyclists to encourage more people to ride, and how to ride safely.
This option needs to expand in tandem with the first option—public transit. When people have a long distance to cover, many will not bike or walk the entire way, but they will do part of it. Bike/walk routes need to connect with transit hubs. Also, there should be space for bikes on public transit.

Until biking and walking are truly safe, many transportation scholars have shown, then a critical mass of citizens will choose to drive instead. We need paths that are pleasant and removed from car traffic. Merely giving bikes and pedestrians marginal and marginalized access (like painted on-road bike lanes) to busy roads or roads shared with cars is not the answer.

Walking and biking also pay health dividends.

We need to not only provide the infrastructure, but also encourage its use through public service announcements/ads that raise awareness and discourage driving.

We won't be able to increase walking and bike ridership without making it a lot more safe.

Again, ways of making biking and walking safe and convenient that lead to the most improvements should be prioritized first, but this is definitely an area where more resources should be committed, as it's one of the modes where more use will lead to the biggest improvements overall.

Bike and pedestrian infrastructure should be the highest priority in combatting climate change at the regional level.

Biking and walking should have priority over private motor vehicle use. On street vehicle parking could be removed to allow the room to expand sidewalks and dedicated bicycle infrastructure.

But again - limit the streets bikes are permitted to ensure vehicles can travel without the added danger and with adequate lanes to get to and from work in a timely fashion. East Burnside's recent relining is a cluster. I never was stopped in traffic for more than a few seconds. Now I can anticipate minutes - adding carbon to the air. Slowly traffic down does not eliminate carbon.

Connectivity, safety, convenience.

Consider restricting auto traffic to local access on bike boulevards such as Clinton, Lincoln, Salmon, Ankeny, AND restricting bikes on nearby main streets such as Burnside, Stark, Belmont, Hawthorne, Division. This would be safer for bikes and less frustrating for drivers.

Create a complete pedestrian network and a complete bike network that is accessible by "interested but concerned" riders. This includes safe crossing and protected bikeways, but we also need to consider how we design our road network. It's much more difficult to create an inviting pedestrian environment or bike facility on a 7-lane arterial. We need to make sure we are moving toward a connective network of smaller streets.

Create more bike/pedestrian opportunities separated from autos to create a safer environment and increase the number of people using these routes.
Curb extensions, more education on "limit lines" and the "california roll" for stopping. Blinking lights, signaling, separate bikes from cars is essential for safety. Discourage cars from driving on bike routes like Salmon, Clinton, etc.

East Portland needs better infrastructure, sidewalks, lighted crossings etc.

Educating those who bike and walk about their role and responsibility in creating safe sidewalk, streets, walking and bicycle paths.

Efforts should be made to catch up to more developed parts of the world (ie Northern Europe) where up to 40% of trips are done by bicycle. Highest priority for this as the cheapest and environmentally best way to move people in a dense area.

Federal and state funds designated to adding sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks. Repaint pedestrian crosswalks that are no longer visible. Enforce speed limits near schools, including side streets. Add more street enforcement to neighborhoods and fine drivers who do not park on the correct side of the street. Reduce obstruction on sidewalks by enforcing city dumping laws.

Filling in the gaps where there aren't enough bike boulevards now, especially north/south on the east side. Going east of 82nd St, to encourage people there to bike more. Solving dicey areas like the transition between the eastside waterfront and lower Division. Clearing up broken glass east of 82nd more often.

How ALL modes of transportation interacting together, cars, cyclist, pedestrians and tri-met– can they all interact simultaneously and still provide safe transit. For example, do bike lanes suddenly end, do cars or buses have sufficient space or too much?

I gave up my car five years ago and was shocked to find how dangerous it is to walk in Portland. I have been nearly hit in crosswalks several times, as has every pedestrian I know. Bike riders also find it very unsafe on the road. Drivers are not looking and don't want to slow down or stop. We need an education program about sharing the road. I called the department responsible for this several years ago and was told that there is no money for such a program which is done in a very limited way now.

I support and frequently participate in biking as a commute option and recreation. I think the general public would support biking investments more if there were restrictions about where bikes SHOULD NOT use roadways. Even as a frequent biker, I am frustrated by the slow riders using prime transit lanes that cause cars and buses to maneuver around bikes (examples: Hawthorne and Belmont).

If you are going to make biking & walking safe in a neighborhood, make sure the streets are good (i.e. no potholes, etc.) first. Otherwise, the naysayers just have a field day.
I'm all for bike lanes and designated bike streets, but the reality is that for nine months out of the year, most bike commuters do not ride in the rain, on the other hand cars are on the road every single day. What about more one-way streets for traffic? More streets like Stark and Washington. In the past year, Division has become a nightmare. What once included multiple lanes for cars, became single lanes with bike lanes from SE 60th up to 82nd, and I rarely see bike riders on this stretch of road. The other consideration should be money and how this will be paid for. Again, tax corporations, not homeowners and small businesses.

Improve existing routes to make them more appealing to all riders. Ex. Upper Lincoln st bicycle boulevard gets nearly 4,000 cars a day. Much too high for target audience.

Improved crosswalks in high traffic areas.

In new subdivisions, bike lanes and walking paths need to be part of the code/design. In existing areas, continue work to add bikeways, like in the inner core of Portland. Keep expanding those routes and discourage automobile traffic on those streets as much as possible. I also think it's high time to make helmets and lights on bikes a law in our region.

Make it safe for 8 year olds to 80 year olds.

Make sure all major vehicle arteries can be crossed every 1/4 mile safely by pedestrians and bicyclists.

Make the difficult trade offs in favor of bicycle facility investment in constrained corridors. Invest in bike facilities that appeal to the most vulnerable users. Children should be able to ride on facilities in the urban environment. Fully protected facilities that are buffered from motor vehicle traffic. Public education campaigns that improve bicycling's image "not just for the spandex crowd."

Making pathways safe, accessible and built to keep maintenance of pathways low. Also keep consider how to minimize illegal camping opportunities along pathways.

Marked crosswalks don't exist on Hawthorne east of 39th. There's one at New Seasons and that's it. Crossing the street by bike or by foot is perilous at almost any time of day.

More buffered bike lanes on high traffic streets.

More investment in downtown Portland. This should be one of the best places to ride with great densities, destinations and slow speeds. Without any good bike facilities, newbies and veterans alike don't like riding in downtown Portland. This is imperative if we are going to keep the downtown vibrant. And the other item is bike share. It would be a very, very good investment for the Metro region to invest money in this. We do it for transit - why not for a self-pedaled "transport" system?

Policies to support making neighborhoods more self-sufficient (groceries and other services within walk/bike distance).

Policy makers should directly experience the problem locations.

Prioritize fixing potholes on bike streets. Work on outer NE/SE walkability.
Prioritize safety over free street parking! (example, remove some parking on the 28th bike route to allow room for actually safe bike & pedestrian space).

Prioritizing the pedestrian safety on high-speed streets like 136th, Powell, and other East-county areas is critical for kids going to school and for adults accessing transit, grocery stores, etc. Encouraging small-biz growth in outer areas -- grocery co-ops, bike shops, etc. -- will increase active transportation, leading to a cycle of improved safety and health.

Protected bike lanes for major north/south, east/west linkages.

Safety Safety Safety! In order to get more people using modes of active transportation we need to make safe facilities that take people where they want to go. More neighborhood bike ways, more separated bike paths and more cycletracks. These improvements have a proven track record of getting people out of their cars and using active modes of transportation. We also need to actively encourage other modes of active transportation such as skateboards, scooters and roller skates. In most places people are already using skateboards as active transportation. And in most places they are barely tolerated on the roads and sidewalks. How many more people would use these modes if they did not need to fear being stopped by the police for no reason other then their choice of mode?

Same as last question, livable neighborhoods close to jobs.

See previous comments.

Separate biking from road traffic when possible.

Sidewalks are missing in newer urban renewal projects especially on the west side (so it seems to me).

Standardized sidewalk widths. So many neighborhood sidewalks are narrow to the point of allowing only one person at a time.

Start with adding sidewalks and making property owners cut back ivy and other crap on their sidewalks or curb edges. I nearly got hit on Se Veterans road last week.

Streamline bike routes - eliminate/reduce stops for bikes, make biking easier (safer) and more people will bike. I hate having to wait for a traffic light protection when it is really about keeping the intersection open for cars. Switch loops embedded in the st. often do not work for just a bike - great example by Benson HS. Peds have the right of way and shouldn't have to wait while the signal turn for them - faster response time.

Take a look at Vancouver BC. We're getting there, but we've lost our nerve. Bike infra is essential to a civilized cityscape. W.r.t. Vancouver BC examine the streets downtown and westend, how they are interrupted for motor vehicles, but bikes go through. Bike boulevards are indicated with a little green bike tab on the street signs. Cycletracks such as on Burrard Bridge. Great stuff.
The people of Oregon need to be re-educated regarding our own and most recent laws regarding marked and unmarked crosswalk laws and right-of-way. For instance, if I stand with one foot in the road or my whole body at Burnside & SE 70th waiting to cross and forming an unmarked crosswalk, generally, 0 to 1 in 20 cars will stop for me. When I or school children attempt to cross the marked crosswalk at Powell near 205, about 20-30% of the time, cars do not stop and, when one fails to stop, more always follow. One area of particular misunderstanding is that drivers do not realize that a mounted cyclist is allowed to cross with the same protections as a pedestrian. Instead, they treat cyclists crossing mounted like jaywalkers, sometimes getting rather angry while breaking the crosswalk. These call for better driver education (are our latest crosswalk laws even included in driver education and testing?) and, especially since we have many tourists, clear signage indicating that pedestrians, cyclists, skateboarders, etc... have the right of way.

The sometimes indiscriminate designation of bike lanes that impede safe auto traffic.

There is a clear role for regional planning for bicycle infrastructure. Like automobile thoroughfares, dedicated bicycle trails should be planned regionally. Please think of trails as more than a route between two points on a line. There is a need for a network of dedicated bicycle trails.

Walking and biking are physically privileged, and every single human being is only temporarily able-bodied. Don't put more money into this area than is put into physical accessibility aids like ramps, elevators, wide corridors, easy to turn faucets, and braille or other aids for the visually impaired.

Walking and cycling need to be integrated into the public transit system at as many points as possible because many of us use both on the same trip to get around.

We need better traffic violation enforcement, for cyclists as well as vehicle drivers.

We should have safer bike routes similar to Copenhagen.

Building a real network to facilitate bicycle travel for all aspects of daily life - e.g., work, grocery shopping, school pickup. Building safer infrastructure (protected lanes, off-street paths). Current infrastructure was built on assumptions of low-traffic streets, which is not the current reality, and will be less so in the future as Portland population increases rapidly.

In terms of the amount invested in biking, walking I'd like policy makers to remember that the majority of people do not bike and will never bike in their daily routines. So enough with the bike path funding and concentrate on walking.

Most frequent areas of collisions/difficulties. I want us to a goal of zero fatalities...and I think we have to look at where these are happening and the circumstances to be able to develop solutions.

Sure, but we already do this pretty well in general. Additional ADA accessibility and sidewalks in neighborhoods where there are none is still a needed improvement.

Walking and biking places within 15-30 min makes sense. People need to get more excersise and we need to get cars off the roads.
Where are the gaps? and take over 82nd from the state, put it on a diet, and make a permanent, transformative change.

Where can we build non-auto transit ONLY. e.g. Sullivan's Gultch, where we can encase a bike transit corridor for a bike freeway. COMMUNICATION how to get information on biking safely to everyone. ENFORCEMENT of bikers who break the laws and ruin it for everyone.

You cannot take away space for cars and give it to bikes. I've heard some scary ideas float about car free streets-in neighborhoods with drivers and cars that would have no where to go. Must be thoughtful.

All modes considered and walk (sidewalks) and bike prioritized on all road construction/paving projects.

Answered on the previous question. More bike/alt transportation route maps. Focus on improving unsafe intersections or helping route bikers around them. Riding on the shoulder of a road with 40-50mph traffic is scary; the draft from big trucks can knock you off-balance and rocks in the bike lane can trip you up, too. I live 6 bike miles from work and would say 90% of the route is ok. It's that other 10% (or even less) that makes me reluctant to do it.

As a bike commuter, I would love to feel safer by having access to more protected bike lanes and cycle paths. Securing new, dedicated state funding for active transportation projects seems like a critical need.

As is the case with transit, as long as automobiles are prioritized in the transportation system in terms of overall space and funding, other modes of transportation will tend to be less convenient and more poorly funded - driving needs to be made less convenient for short trips and daily activities.

Balancing bikes and vehicles. Vehicles are not going to go away, so using common sense to make sure both are not vulnerable (looking at your turn lanes!).

Bicycle infrastructure investments should be made on a large scale ASAP. Engineering for bicycle infrastructure should be given the same amount of care as for motor vehicle infrastructure. Connectivity in the bicycle transportation system should be a high priority.

Bicycling in central Portland (between the Willamette River and 205) is poised for huge gains with a dedicated investments in protected bicycling facilities.

Bike lane safety needs to be improved. Cars tend to swing over into the bike lane.

Bike paths should be designated on streets that are not major car traffic corridors. Expand sidewalks and have bikes share walks with pedestrians instead of cars.

Classes for bikers.

Connecting neighbors to their neighborhood retail/commercial centers and their schools. Safe crossings for busy streets and safe ways to access businesses on arterials.

Continuity of bikeways and paths throughout the region should be a top priority.

Every 10 to 20 blocks there should be a safe North-South or East-West bikeway. It doesn't have to be exclusive to bikes, but it should have a marked, designated bike lane.
Focus on unsafe connections and gaps on existing routes. Create bikeways that families are comfortable using. Help outlying suburbs implement the innovative and creative solutions that Portland has pioneered. Places like Oregon City are 10-20 years behind Portland in infrastructure design and safety features. Consider adopting a level of service for bike and ped like we have for cars, rate the safety and comfort of pedestrian and bike transportation to make it more measurable.

Funding.

Getting started now vs later.

How to make pedestrians and cyclists feel safe, how to make this type of travel efficient.

I don't own a car, and it isn't even an inconvenience. If it becomes more convenient everyone will benefit.

Infrastructure but also education. Separating bicycles and pedestrians from traffic. Routes and sidewalks in areas without any.

Install separated facilities wherever possible. Sharrows on major roads and scary lane changes works for me but not most people. We need to make biking and walking super-safe to get the majority out of their cars.

It seems that Portland focuses most of its investments on safe biking, when bicyclists are simply a very vocal minority. ALL of us must be pedestrians at some point or another, and those of us who take transit are well aware of a number of areas that are unsafe for pedestrians.

Look at where you can feed two or three birds with one seed. For example; building a bike path along I-5 stretching from east waterfront to the Interstate Bridge along the shoulder of the I-5 freeway would make for a much faster and safer travel for commuters (much like the path along I-205). I-5 would get so much more use. Drivers on the freeway seeing bicyclist would be great promotion, especially while they sit in traffic. Posting signing and using a media campaign on the health benefits of bicycling during rush hour traffic would be a wise strategy. Having easy access points along the route into neighborhoods main streets would make it very appealing and accessible. LED solar lighting along the path and small amenities such as tire repair stations and covered paths would only entice more people to use this route.

Making sure the homeless isn't hanging around the paths and making sure the paths are safe.

More & better bike lane allocations, perhaps bike/walk bridges in hazardous areas.

More bike infrastructure.

Network continuity and connectivity. Non-motorized infrastructure that is separated from vehicular traffic (including parked cars and parking areas). A priority for projects to happen without being stymied by business concerns for auto parking.

Off Road Connections where traffic (bike and people) can move Banfield/Greeley/RedElectric.

People who bike and walk subsidize all the other transportation modes. How can we make it pay off financially for people to bike and walk?
Please please please please please stop rolling over to automotive interests when deciding how to invest in active transportation projects. The last thing this city needs is more free parking. In fact, most streets with significant pedestrian and bicycle use would be much safer and more comfortable if car parking was removed entirely.

Protected bike lines.

Protecting bikes against motor vehicles and protecting pedestrians from bikers.

Reducing car and pedestrian or car on bicycle accidents; creating divided lanes for cyclists, intersections that are safe without relying on car drivers to obey signs.

Safe routes for school kids. I've read that about 1/3 of morning and afternoon traffic is due to parents driving kids to school. In our neighborhood, it is difficult for kids to ride to school, especially in the darker winter, due to a lack of safe bike and walking routes.

Safe shared pedestrian and bike spaces (going over bridges).

Safety.

Setting up a system more like the Netherlands where there are bike lanes separated by a curb rather than a painted line, and setting up lights at intersections that let cars go, then bikes go, then pedestrians would help alleviate backups, which cause frustration and ultimately make travel by alternative means more dangerous.

Start with the poorer areas of town first so that there are not pockets that no one can pass through safely.

Take into account high traffic - both auto and bike - areas and reduce risk for bikers and walkers by creating reduced but more efficient paths for automotive traffic.

Take more cars off the road to make room for cyclists and pedestrians.

The efficient fast flow of motor vehicles, abundant and free parking, as well as a mass culture that is pro-car and anti-bike are the biggest impediments to increasing alternative mode share in Portland. As long as those conditions exist throwing money at bike lanes, crosswalks, and other infrastructure only increases the already troubling trend of dividing folks by their travel modes. Drivers are getting more aggressive and bike lash is increasing in Portland (from my 2 wheeled street level experience) i know that we are Americans and we think that every problem is solved by throwing money at it, but in my opinion a bigger picture perspective and conversation would be the most productive action at this juncture.

The only way we will significantly raise the number of bike trips is to create more car-free bike paths and protected lanes.

This is incredibly important if we are going to have any impact at all.

This seemed to be wrapped into the description of the previous item. Bike, ped and transit need strong connections as people are multi modal.
This should be one of the highest priorities as bike paths are some of the cheapest investment and can have a high impact on personal and environmental health. Also, the more people you move out of cars and onto bikes will improve traffic for the remaining cars, trucks and buses.

Walking is the more important factor. We have spent enough on bikes.

We should make intersections smaller for pedestrian safety. Bump out corners prevent right hooks.

When a bike lane disappears and then reappears, or does not cover the full stretch of a roadway it is very dangerous for bicyclists.

When possible, separate truck, auto, biking and walking routes to provide safety for all.

Where facilities and improvements have yet to be made, or are limited. ie eats of 82nd. The inner city has great infrastructure and yes some of it can be even better or more visionary, but how about some equity first? Make biking better and safer and more convenient in places where it is currently decidedly, not.

82nd is supposedly a major North-South bike path? Outer Eastside provides plenty of industrial tax rev, so let's have some bike paths, sidewalks, and community-core development!

Again ensure equity. Put more money into creating connectivity and sidewalks in outer eastside Portland.

Again make sure areas of poverty have access to bike and walking paths.

I'm too old to feel safe biking but I do walk when I can - to the post office (1.5 mi. rt), light shopping (2.2 mi. rt), the library (4 mi. rt). I don't have sidewalk down my side yard (120 x 4 feet) and I can't afford what it would cost to put one in. Lots of the streets in my area have no sidewalks but we also don't have heavy traffic. Bicycles on our streets are becoming downright dangerous. Tried to get off the Fremont Bridge past the new construction to turn right on Fremont lately? Scary, especially in the dark. Someone is gonna get killed on that stretch of road before it gets better. And no more turns on red because of bike boxes - wasting gas and time, especially when there are no bikes there.

Many people are not able to bicycle, due to health or the need to present a formal appearance on the job. Because bicycles are less stable, they are dangerous to other vehicles. Driving carefully near bicycles slows traffic.

Mixed on this. The $$ invested in bike lanes is silly, you just aren't going to get that many people willing to commute by bike. There's a finite number of them, and the investment exceeds them, IMO. Walking is great, more people should do it, but again, limited numbers will, even with encouragement. More sidewalks would be good.

Mixing bicycle traffic with any other kind of traffic is not safe.
More education for bicycle riders how to coexist on streets with cars to counteract the current arrogance they seem to have about owning the right of way in all cases on city streets. Have the cities actively look for and take care of clearing problems along sidewalks that block line of sight and obstruct walking such as bushes, hedges, large grasses and low hanging trees. Better educate joggers about the dangers using the streets instead of sidewalks.

MUP lanes are cool, but they need better lighting, preferably LEDs that are both wind and solar powered.

Safer routes, more paths, more bike racks on buses. Having some means of securing a bike when it has to be left at the stop because the bus rack is full. Asking the driver to wait while the bike is locked up at the stop, I realize the drivers have schedules but I find the drivers unwilling to wait while I lock up the bike at the stop so I can still ride the bus.

Working toward making Portland full of walkable communities. Let's try to keep our cars in the garage.

Ensure safe bike/other wheeled small transport lanes throughout the Portland Metro area. • Create a small transport citizens panel to provide evaluation and input when considering options. • Look at licensing cyclists. • Make bike route maps readily available online and in print. • Support a robust "yellow bike" share program. Create jobs for maintaining share bikes. Equip these bike with trackers to decrease theft. Incorporate bus routes with share bike terminals to encourage more bike usage in traffic-congested areas.

1) Often bike paths just end leaving bikers suddenly in traffic on narrow roads in the city. 2) More sidewalks. Children in my neighborhood must walk quit far to and from school on a narrow and heavily used road. This very dangerous for all.

Again, balance.

Avoiding more impermeable surfaces (i.e., gravel or dirt paths rather than concrete sidewalks).

Bike lanes on more major thoroughfares; make the lanes consistent (don't end a bike lane for 1 block, then continue it on the next block; better detection of bikes at traffic signals. I avoid cycling on thoroughfares with inconsistent bike lanes. They are not much better than no bike lane because frequently cars are forced to hit the brakes when a cyclist merges due to the bike lane ending.

Bike lanes physically separated from the road.

Bike riders crossing against lights. helmets, flashers. NO BLACK CLOTHES!

Biker and pedestrian safety is important.

Bikes and pedestrians need room. Senior walkers can be very intimidated by bikes, skateboards, etc. Leave enough comfortable space for all users!

Bikes should be licensed, too, and help pay for the maintenance of the bike lanes.

Biking and walking paths. Proper sidewalks.

Consider developing paths/trails that can be used by both bikers and walkers so that 2 separate systems are not created. (Cost should be less for one system compared to two systems).
Consider that more families are biking and that there needs to be safer lanes for children to ride in. Also, the SW area of Portland (Burlingame, Sunset, Gardenhome, Beaverton Hillsdale Highway) are all in need of improvement in the biking/walking safety.

Continuous safe passage -- gaps without bike lanes, for instance, are dangerous. (I just got hit and run in one of those gaps.)

Current and potential use, with the highest consideration given to safety concerns.

Density.

Develop biking corridors off of main arteries to allow safe biking routes and not interrupt vehicle flow.

Develop more off-street walking & biking paths.

Don't overspend on biking infrastructure. Use striping and signaling. We can't afford nor need separated bike facilities.

Ensure that bike paths are contiguous.

Existing regulations regarding liability discourage homeowners from supporting neighborhood sidewalks. In Multnomah Village all we have are muddy gravel shoulders to potholed roads, not good for walking or biking. Consider using regulations to incentivize creation of sidewalks, not to create more obstacles.

Find diverse, reliable funding streams to support build out. Prioritize projects that reprioritize roadway. We already have a ton of pavement - let's just allocate it differently. Storing cars should be a low priority compared to moving people by bike or foot. In places with ample roadway (and parking) but without sidewalks, could we add a pedestrian lane? Much like a bike lane, but for peds? We've already paid for the pavement, let's not add more if there's roadway being underutilized.

Focus on underserved areas; areas of high impact. For example, I would love to ride my bike to work, but feel unsafe riding Barbur Blvd.

Focus on walking safety, bicycles create risk for walkers as does auto traffic.

Focus primarily on critical gaps currently existing. The infrastructure today is quite extensive.

For the longest time sidewalks were optional in the city of Portland, i.e. with new development, they were at the discretion of the Transportation Engineer....as a result we have lots of gaps in our sidewalks. I'd rather more money was spent on sidewalks which can be used by everyone.....bicycle facilities can only used by a small population.

Germany-style slow speed limits and switch backs in residential areas. 100% sidewalks by 2020!

I am particularly interested in increased safety along SW Taylor's Ferry Rd in SW Portland.

I know a lot of thought has gone into this by BTA, Portland etc but it has to be done all the way to really work.

I see the need for more bike lanes but not always at the expense of car traffic. I think we need dedicated and separated bike and vehicular routes. More bike rule enforcement would also be helpful.

I would do more errands without my car if we had more safe sidewalks.
Impact of hard surface on stormwater in constrained areas requires real solutions. Including bike options that are completely separated from cars.

It's still unbelievable to me how many miles of unbuilt sidewalks Portland has. And then City Hall wonders about how to prevent pedestrian deaths. We need more sidewalks, NOT bike lanes, by the way. There are already plenty of those, and they don't contribute to a roadway's overall safety either.

Keeping bikes and autos safely separated from each other.

Low cost shoulder widening instead of sidewalk creation.

Make sure to include all of Portland, not just the east side.

Making the investments as equitable as possible throughout the region as the more dense communities tend to receive the most infrastructure investments. However, Portland residents should not be required to subsidize other areas as they do for many services.

More concerned with safe walking options, not everyone can bike.

More serious traffic enforcement by police.

More sidewalks in SW Portland. I live in the Arnold Creek neighborhood and you can even walk between the middle school and the elementary school. Also, walking to transit center (Barbur) is unsafe because the sidewalks are not consistent. I would walk but it is too scary with narrow lanes and no sidewalks. We call it "the gauntlet" because if you walk it you take your life in your hands.

More sidewalks mean EVERYWHERE - not just the Pearl District or SE/NE Portland.

Most used walkways. Utilizing affordable and smart solutions.

My priority is sidewalks -- people need to walk more for health and continued mobility into old age.

Not practical in much of the west side for most casual or elderly bikers.

Pedestrian separation from Bike Lanes.

People won't do something unless it benefits them, doesn't cost money, and is instantly available.

Perhaps with the increased biking population, peds and bikers should be segregated?

Possibly making a few streets "bikes only."

Provide as many sidewalks as possible, specifically in Southwest Portland.

Public input and low cost alternatives to costly infrastructure.

Public safety for one. There are few sidewalks in the SW area away from downtown Portland. Bike paths are getting better, but there is room for improvement. Here again, PR plays a big role in changing the minds of those who are resistant to change and rather contribute to the traffic problems. Consideration should be given to how to invest without raising taxes for property owners which are already too high. Tax developers and those that contribute to the congestion.

Recognition that it is still a small o proportion of transportation. Focus on maintaining what we've got. Paving, etc.
Safe connections to transit. More widespread use of crosswalks with RFBs. More bus shelters.

Safe routes to schools should be prioritized.

Safety day and night for bikes and peds is challenging and key to getting the most out of these alternatives -- for people as well as for the climate goals.

Safety. Road and sidewalk maintenance. Requiring and enforcing that neighborhood plantings along sidewalks do not impede pedestrians from walking two abreast.

See my previous comment.

Separate protected lanes for bicycles and for pedestrians like the layouts in the Netherlands and in Germany.

Separated bikeways as in Europe.

Side walks - Vermont finally is getting sidewalks and Multnomah blvd but they stopped at the SW community center - so I have to walk down a busy street with no side walks to get anywhere.

Sidewalks. Safe crossing of major streets/highways when using TriMet. Increase bike lanes all the way in main arterials into town(Barbur, Hwy 43/Macadam, Bvrtn-Hillsdale.

Some areas such as the SW that were developed only with the car in mind need a comprehensive approach including adding infrastructure but possibly zone changes to improve density near transit plus bikeable areas.

Some parts of the region are very deficient in this infrastructure and it forces residents to drive. Invest in places where the investment is likely to lead to people walking and biking for transportation (not exercise or recreation) instead of driving. Near or to centers and corridors, better access to transit, better access to key destinations, separated bike paths on busy streets where there is little connectivity, build sidewalks on busy corridors.

SW Portland needs more sidewalks in residential areas. If it were safer to bike down Barbur, I would bike to work.

The bike priorities on small, quiet streets is nice, but what about barbur and capital hwy for being pedestrian friendly. It is too dangerous to even consider biking downtown.

The biking encouraged in Portland is not the safest. Skinny tires with very small contact on the road surface and cyclists not obeying road rules are is inherently unsafe.

The safety of bikers and walkers. Bike lanes and sidewalks/trails should not be next to major roads where air pollution levels are high.

The transportation budgets need to move away from the old model of adding car lanes and instead bring existing streets to a level that they are safe enough for riding a bike. The public needs education about the long-term cost of adding lanes and that they aren't a solution to reducing congestion. This education needs to be part of planning and community outreach. It's good to explain why something that may seem like a good idea isn't.
There are really dangerous areas on the south side that people on bikes tend to frequent simply because there really are no nearby options. Barbur Blvd and the Ross Island Bridge and Powell especially. This should be priority #1. Walking should not be an afterthought in these policy discussions. Often the last thing to go into a neighborhood (espec in SW PDX) is a sidewalk. Walking yes, bikes no They already think they own the roads.

We have GOT to stop designing Portland for CARS! This is totally 1950s thinking. Go to ANY city in Europe to see the beautiful *people*-friendly cities. They have ZERO surface parking lots--and very few cars visible anywhere in their downtown cores. Cities are about PEOPLE--not cars!! If you want to see failed experiments in which cars dominate, go to "downtown" Beaverton (if you can find it!) and the unbelievably awful south downtown couplet in Salem. It's 100% about the car in those places, and the results are catastrophically bad streets in which people just drive right *through* town without ever stopping. City officials haven't given people any reason TO stop, other than to look for parking--which accounts for 35% of traffic congestion downtown, by the way.

Where sidewalks and bike lanes are more needed and most used by both parties. Whether or not presently built neighborhoods and communities have "Complete Streets" and if they do not then prioritize the implementation of this policy to invest there first before making investments within areas that already have a completed network of complete streets. A measurable baseline should be established by each jurisdiction such that we can begin to know if we are making progress in addressing the implementation of "Complete Streets", use of GIS tools could help greatly if keeping track of progress (e.g. linear miles of improvement made).

While it is admirable to add sidewalks, particularly in places that had numerous hit and runs with pedestrians, feeling safe enough to walk using them is just as critical. Parks, less frequented trails need some kind of policing so people feel safe to to use them.

1. Do not eliminated on-street parking. 2. Consider areas east of 82nd. 3. Look at the demographics prior to implementing. 4. Get community feedback prior to implementing/investment.

Again, the outer areas of the city suffer greatly in this area. Many of our neighborhoods have no sidewalks or bike paths.

Any new housing developments should be connected to bike paths and bike routes to most traveled areas. See Davis, CA for ideas on this. All neighborhoods need safe sidewalks and paths. Bike lanes or paths need to be wide enough with plenty of separation from traffic--same with walking paths--maybe even barriers.

Bicycles should have larger, stronger lights, front an back. People need to wear lighter colored clotjhing in the dark and/or wear reflecting tapes on clothing.
Bike transport should be separated, not combined, with automobiles. Bicycles should make a significant financial contribution to the facilities dedicated to them.

Bikers should be licensed like drivers and routes should be separated from heavy car routes and protected by lights and stop signs, just like car routes.

Commuter safety, what routes make the most sense (bikes for example) that provide the safest route (least amount of car traffic) to ensure highest possible safety. continued public education on driving near / next to bike lanes, promoting use, involving neighborhood associations, schools, etc.

Demographics - will that neighborhood/area use. In other words, frequency of use - will be a good investment.

Do NOT put bicycle lanes between parked cars and the sidewalk - as this only creates confusion for drivers. If you are serious about separating cars and bicycles, create designated "bicycle only" lanes. Enforce traffic laws and encourage good behavior by drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians - i.e. ticket those who are not following the rules, provide education on "how to be a good commuter."

I was on a walking tour of a portion of SW trails just today and its an amazing system that has cost very little to create. I'm interested in recreating it in East Portland and getting more outside the box thinking would really help. I'd like to see more consideration for non standard sidewalks because we would all be bankrupt of we paved every street and created every sidewalk so lets be more open minded.

Making more sidewalks and bicycle paths is my topic priority. Not only is it the most cost efficient, it also promotes health, community, and has the least environmental impact. My neighborhood has some of the worst air quality in the city and also the worse walking and biking opportunities. Therefore people choose to use their cars for their own personal safety.

More safety signals, lowered speed limits and updated infrastructure like curb cuts, dividers, rotaries and other traffic calming features. Bike lanes and sharrows can only help so much. Slowing traffic is the root. Solve the moat dangerous not the most vulnerable.

Please consider the future increases in foot and bike traffic! Driving single-occupant vehicles will be unaffordable for many who currently transport themselves in this manner. The trains and buses are already overcrowded.

Require developers to include food and other shopping within the new communities. Don't force people to drive everywhere.

Shuting off to streets to traffic, better lighting, cracking down on drivers who ignore pedestrians.

Sidewalks are a necessity. I would like to see more streets with 'bike route' painted on the side streets, east of 82nd av.

Sidewalks are important as well as making sure all the streets are paved. This provides a major impediment to walking and biking safely with all the unpaved and no sidewalk areas in the less affluent parts of town.
The fact that cars kill us all and should be banned wherever humans are.

The same issues as I previously addressed, mostly those of cost and even and fair taxation. I am VERY concerned about the rash of pedestrian and bicycle accidents in metro Portland and, as a resident of East County, am concerned about the lack of safe crosswalks and other safe pedestrian thoroughfares in East County.

What part of town most people walk in and invest more heavily there. More sidewalks are definitely needed in east portland as there are few and not all of the streets are paved either.

When I go out in my power scooter, I use the bike path because the sidewalks slope from driveways and trees' roots make the sidewalks bumpy. However, I do not feel safe riding my scooter in the bike paths.

Ask SW PDX residents where they want sidewalks.

Correcting existing walking hazards.

First: connectivity. There are currently many places where relatively short unsafe segments discourage people from using bikes or walking. For example, the difficulty crossing Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway (particularly in Raleigh Hills) scares away many people who live within a mile of shopping, schools, parks and other destinations. Second: Consider the infrastructure savings of trips shifted from personal motor vehicles to biking or walking. Third: Consider the health effects and health care costs of transportation modes; i.e. motor vehicle use increases rates of asthma and other respiratory ailments and is strongly associated with obesity.

Following routes that people will actually use. Safe routes to schools for kids should be essential, and separated bike lanes from traffic, as well. Cycling and trucking should be separated, as well.

How to implement it quickly and efficiently as possible.

If there were more safe sidewalks, especially in SW Portland, you would alleviate quite a bit of traffic since kids could walk to SW schools SAFELY. Dedicated bike paths are much better than sharing narrow, busy roads in SW Portland.

Investment in bicycling has proven to give the most bang for the buck. Much cheaper than transit and, of course, auto travel. For example, the Milwaukie LRT line will cost around $1.5 billion plus operation cost for around 30,000 riders per day. For a fraction of this cost, the city of Portland has seen more trips accommodated by bike for a fraction of this investment.

Only if 100% information on costs to homeowners (i.e., taxes, special assessments) and impact to ALL the neighborhoods that would be affected. And allowing testimony by those parties. Lately it seems that about 15% is heard more and catered to than the 85% who oppose such plans.

There's been a great emphasis on biking connections, but it's time to focus on improving walking connections, especially along corridors like SW Barbur and SW Beaverton-Hillsdale.
Use simple paved asphalt paths to create lots of walkways quickly. The concrete curb-n-gutter approach will be rejected by homeowners who view it as an unfair cost to them just to serve their neighbors, who seem to receive the benefit without the expense. Sidewalks, especially in southwest Portland, have typically been spot installs, that penalize a small group of nearby residents, but often don't connect to a continuous pathway for real use - so a few neighbors pay for unused, disconnected pieces of concrete and no one benefits. Don't regale us with your rhetoric about making the city better, and then fail to build a coordinated system. If you won't start at business centers and build complete sidewalks/paths/trails outwards in continuous, connected arteries, then do NOTHING!

Biking and walking areas can balance between recreation and transportation functions. Completion of sidewalks and paths that will fill current gaps. Connections between significant places; e.g. schools, jobs, shopping, parks, etc. and between transit routes. Cost to individual households, targeting low income areas and increasing human powered traffic to grocery stores, parks..including thinking about the 'social determinants of health.' Emphasize walking first biking second. Improve feeders from suburbs to multi-use bike paths and transit stops. Only if bike paths are built that are separate from autos. Pretty please put sidewalks along Oatfield Road! Wait, is this only for Multnomah County? Dang, pass the word along then, please. Prioritizing walkable neighborhoods includes zoning changes for mixed-use, quality density. Make sure to provide the private market with tools to make this happen. Providing light and security along bike and pedestrian paths at night. Safety for cycling and walking needs to be much better, and traffic laws need to be enforced. Should have a barrier for safety. Sidewalks are a real issue in many unincorporated areas and areas in East Multnomah County. Cities and counties need to look at systematic ways to make sidewalk and road improvements that include bike lanes. This is so important! There are lots of roads near where I live that I don't feel comfortable walking my dog or taking my kiddo for a walk because there is little to no shoulder, let a lone a path/sidewalk. This needs to be a major priority, the costs of these investments are small compared to the payback in health and reduced carbon footprint. We've been fully funding hwys and streets for a century now, it's time to catch up on the infrastructure for active transportation. Yes but only after suitable investment has been made to improve our roads. Adding walking and bike paths where appropriate. Adding sidewalks to roads lacking sidewalks. Creating walking routes that aren't up against a busy highway. Commuter routes should have priority. Build off main roads where possible.
Destinations that people are riding to, and filling gaps in the bike lane and multi-use path systems. connecting the "orphan bike lanes" and "bike lanes to nowhere" would be a good start.

How to do it without screwing up the flow of normal traffic. In other words, DO NOT sacrifice traffic lanes to enhance biking and walking.

I believe that biking and walking are LOCAL decisions made by CITIES - not regional priorities by Metro. Metro needs to focus on regional transport - highways and transit, not local needs.

I believe that biking and walking are local issues that need to be addressed by the cities individually, not by Metro as a whole. Why should one city, for example, Gresham, be able to take regional funding from, say, Hillsboro, for walking paths, that are clearly not regional modes of transport? Metro needs to focus on regional solutions, and cities focus on local solutions. So I do support the investment, but I support it where it's accountable to my locally elected city councils - not a disinterested Metro board that favors pet projects and special interests, not the needs of our communities.

If the density of a neighborhood increases with development, the safety of walking and biking needs to be invested in - preferably by the developers. Also, please look into using right of ways to connect walking paths (for example, creating a safe path from Metzger to Garden Home to Multnomah Village.

In this order: cost of implementing policy, needs of community.

Keep bike-ped routes off of major freight routes if possible. A parallel route that is not in the path of heavy traffic is going to be safer. Making sure the trail systems connect to employment, school and recreation destinations.

Lighting of walkways, safer means of pedestrian crossing, establish rules for bikes such as right-of-way and road-to-sidewalk transition rules.

Linking and extending current routes, so people can get farther away without having to resort to cars.

Look at the major housing areas and connect neighborhoods to major thoroughfares so we can bike and walk in bike lanes and sidewalks. There are so many cars that do not know how to share the road with bicyclist unless there is a marked bike lane or sidewalk for pedestrians.

More and safer bike lanes, better lighting, improve roadways/bike lanes.

My walking is limited by pain and I always need to call for a pick up somewhere along the way.

Need education campaign for drivers on how to share the road.

Not so much fun to bike in the rain. I support safe bike routes, but don't see it becoming much more popular.

Not wasting money. Safe biking and pedestrian facilities don't have to be expensive, they have to be useful and logical.

Prioritize safe routes to schools.
Providing reasonable facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians that compliment motor transportation facilities, and that do not negatively impact maintenance funding for roads.

Safety, cost, environment, local need.

Safety: In Washington County, there are many areas with non-continuous sidewalks because it is suburbia. What will help significantly is more street lighting, especially on Hall Blvd and Greenburg Rd., areas served by buses. Biking: I have noticed, as a cyclist from inner Portland, is there not a lot of safety materials for bikers. Cyclists in the area do not think about helmets, rear and headlights. There are many busy intersections (i.e. Durham and Upper Boones Ferry, and Hall and Oleson Rd.) where motorists do not yield to cyclists and pedestrians when turning right. Installing visible signs and getting buy-in by Tigard/Tualatin police, would increase safety for both cyclists AND pedestrians.

Sidewalks and streets wide enough to safely bike on are lacking in many parts of the metro area.

Suburban communities need more ped/bike worthy destinations higher road speeds (seen in suburban areas) require protected pathways.

The area that would benefit from this, close in to PDX.

The safety and accessibility of walking is essential. Biking somewhat less so. In either case both must be considered along with vehicle commuting - for good or ill it is the main form of transportation - for now. Critical - keep needs of seniors and disabled in mind. And some bike riders are very aggressive - that must be considered in planning.

This needs to be a city level process - NOT a regional process. How many of us walk or bike from one city to the next, on a routine basis? Very few. It is not a regional mode of transport. Metro needs to focus on the regional - things that affect multiple cities, that affect multiple counties. The cities are the right organization to plan for cycling and pedestrian needs - NOT Metro.

Too many of our neighborhoods here in Garden Home don't have sidewalks, so walking means walking in the street.

We need to create more walkable and bike-able communities. There are so many communities where people cannot walk or bike safely to their local store. We should promote this method of everyday travel to reduce vehicular traffic, promote social interaction and environment interaction.

We should emphasize developing our local stormwater courses and channels with bike/pedestrian paths and connect them to the existing facilities like Fanno Creek and others.

Where highest accident risks are currently AND linkage between bike/ped lanes/sidewalks.

Biking and walking are healthy ways to get around or to get exercise so I support making it safe and convenient to do so. But I am not going to bicycle home from a dinner out on a dark and rainy night (the norm in Portland for most of the year) so I still need safe and efficient roads.
Build more sidewalks in the SW area. Too many suburban neighborhoods are unsafe for kids and older folk. And get rid of those open deep ditches on narrow two-lane roads. Many times there are no sidewalks so any walking must be done in the road with traffic.

Designating family friendly routes specifically tailored to keep kids off of busy roads.

Filling gaps in sidewalks and trails.

I would support a slight increase from current funding levels. Small 'missing link' projects seem most efficient.

Incorporate green stormwater management into sidewalks and bicycle paths. Include offstreet bicycle routes for commuters.

Making safe connections between existing routes.

Provide overpasses and underpasses to provide convenient walking and biking.

Providing sidewalks where there are none currently.

Safety of children walking and biking to school should be the top priority. Do not reduce auto lanes.

The weather should be considered. Also frequency of use. Frequently used paths should be maintained much better. Paths to nowhere should be avoided.

There are areas where biking and walking are not safe options. All major roads should have an area where it is safe for bikes to travel. All major roads should have sidewalks for pedestrians.

We need more road improvement first.

Again start with the area most neglected due to income earned.

Again, the order of magnitude is the question. We need to be realistic about biking. Our weather is not conducive for biking (except for the few hard core riders - it's doubtful we'll ever have 20%+ year-round bike share commuters) and we have hills that are impediments (contrast the Netherlands, which is flat).

As sort of an add-on to the previous policy, people need safe access to public transit in order to use it. This will also help with mobility, keeping people working and healthy.

Bikers help move folks. However, they ignore traffic signs and expect cars to watch for them. So many bikers run red lights and stop signs that it is almost hard to sympathize with them. I would prefer that some effort be put to both these but transit, bus and light rail, need more resources than either of these.

Close the gaps in the walking/biking paths! For example, the hwy 26/cedar hills underpass is completely pedestrian-hostile! AND it was recently redesigned and built(!??!?) there are sidewalks and walk/wait signals on both sides, but no safe way to walk under that bridge.

Driver education regarding non-auto road usage will help improve safety. Bicyclers need similar education.

Environmental and health factors.
Having a sidewalk or bike lane just end is not just annoying, it can be very unsafe. Sometimes, if no pedestrians, I will ride on the sidewalk. If walkers are there, then I get off and walk but it's slower going, obviously. Long distances between crosswalks encourage people to cross where it isn't safe, without lights, and very dangerous. Newly-built crosswalks now are so nice!

I am not a great fan of biking. They do not follow the rules, i.e. run stop lights and stop signs whenever they want as one example. Unless there is clear room for them, it is dangerous and drivers do not like them.

I love to walk on errands. but the rebuilt cedar hills/hwy 26 intersection is insanely pedestrian hostile! make sure that significant areas are connected -- give concentrations of people someplace worth going to.

I moved to Portland precisely because I wouldn't need to use a car to get anywhere. Prioritize bike riders by building protected, separated bike lanes. Close streets like Mississippi Avenue to all car traffic - make it just for pedestrians. This would hugely improve the revenues of the businesses on that street and make Portland a world class city. We need to create more neighborhood greenways and car-free streets!!!

If biking and walking improvements are made, something should be done about the few bikers and walkers that don't obey traffic rules. I see this in NW Pearl area the most. East-side seems better.

Improve bike lanes and connections to bike paths Corner of 174th & Bronson is a current poblem.

Incorporate planting of trees, shrubs and flowers.

Increased safety for bikes.

It's often difficult for cars the share the road with walkers and bikers. At times, it is just plain dangerous for those not in cars.

Lights and crosswalks. Have law enforcement make it a priority to pull over drivers who violate ORS 811.005-811.065.

make walking a priority, not cars & driving.

Make walkways pleasant and safe for women.

More sidewalks would help.

Need to look at safety and convenience cases separately. A sidewalk to protect peds in an unsidewalked suburban area should be given higher priority than finding a bike lane for convenience.

Physical separation of bicycles and automobiles or don't make more bike "lanes".
Please work to separate bike and pedestrian traffic from auto traffic, especially in downtown Portland. I am strictly a motorist, never a bicyclist, and I drive in fear of injuring someone on a bicycle. I can never tell if they are going to stop at a stop sign or traffic signal. Or weave between cars moving on the streets of downtown Portland. Or speed up beside me on my right side even after I have signaled a right hand turn well in advance and moved over to the right side of the lane to indicate my intention to turn. I have experienced all of these situations in the past three months while driving in downtown Portland. I don't want to be involved in an accident, but I honestly can't tell what the rules are. Give the bikes a separated lane, like on SW Broadway in front of PSU, on more streets in downtown.

Safe places to bike and walk; useful transit for biking and walking; away from car etc traffic as much as possible; incentivize; easy, affordable ways to combine with transit.

Safe walking is a huge issue where I live in Washington County. I'm in an unincorporated area and live on a main thoroughfare (Butner Road) that sees heavy traffic daily from diverted travelers from Murray and Cedar Hills. We were supposed to have sidewalks put in, but now they say there is no money. I would like to at least have calming bumps. It is not safe to walk down our street to Commonwealth Lake which many people do, even with strollers and kids! Scares me!

SAFETY FIRST. Need a lot more safe sidewalks and bike lanes.

Safety for everyone.

Safety, particularly in locations where active and automotive routes intersect.

See previous answer.

-Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits -Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles -Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit -Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life -Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals -Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency.

Take money away from fossil fuel driven vehicles and use this money for bike and pedestrian services.

The existence of sidewalks and bike paths needs to be considered. In my area, there are portions of streets that have no sidewalks. People would walk more if they didn't have to walk in the road.

The lack of continous sidewalks in our communities is pitiful and ridiculous.

Walkways should be SAFE, so individuals [women, youths] feel free to use them, and somewhat shielded from high speed [over 30 mph] cars/trucks. Walking next to large, fast vehicles is loud and spooky, especially when there is no curb, and you know a car could just swerve and get you. And rocks get kicked up too. I think if lanes were made on wide paths, they could be shared by bikers and walkers.
Again, please prioritize areas that serve lower-income and working class people, further away from the main city core. Safe walking and biking make a community more liveable and there are so many people who deserve that same benefit who have been pushed further out but still have unpaved roads/no sidewalks/lack of crosswalks and facilities, etc. I appreciate every improvement I see around the area but the distribution feels unequitable to the population.

Create simple, direct and connected bike routes that go where people want to go. Too many of our bike routes are convoluted and disconnected.

I would prioritize increasing access to bus lines and other public transit above this. It is important, but the people who spend the most to get to work as a percentage of their incomes are low income Oregonians often working multiple jobs. They need better access to buses and mass transit before bike lanes. Providing sidewalks in east Portland is also a priority.

Many of our bike routes lack connectivity, or have inadequate pieces that prevent safe travel. Focus simple, direct, well-connected bike routes. Include routes to and for recreation (to Forest Park, Sauvie Island, the Gorge, the Coast, etc).

Need this beyond just the urban core. View through an Environmental Justice lens.

Wide and flat sidewalks.

Bikes do NOT make it safe for walking because they tend to speed using expensive bikes for that purpose so walkers and bikes need to be separate (ditto for horses if you ever consider throwing them in the mix - example Stub Stewart State Park).

Biking should not be at the expense of motor vehicles. Don't steal lanes or parking to support what is a phantom population of bikers. See unused bike lane on SW Stark street as an example. Complete waste of money and creates auto congestion. We need safer sidewalks for pedestrians.

Build continuous paths and sidewalks.

Concentrate more on walking...add sidewalks. Don't reduce roads for bikes, especially highly traveled roads. Design/invest in an as flat as possible bike route from the west side downtown.

Connecting destinations with safe routes.
Continue to make sure drivers are aware of presence of bikers and walkers where paths cross streets, especially when it's not at a marked corner or intersection. Really like the new double red lights on Hall Blvd where the powerlines path crosses Hall between SW Greenway Rd and the railroad tracks. Also the new, low-mounted, rectangular, orange flashing lights on SW West Union Road near 185th, and along that section where NW Bethany Blvd changes name to NW Kaiser Rd. They make it easier for cars to be alert for bikes and walkers. Drivers need to learn to adjust their speed and attention to make both bikers and walkers safer. This is the one reason I won't ride my bike here -- drivers are either totally ignorant or wilfully rude where most pedestrians and bike riders need to share space. As a driver, I REALLY try to always pay attention to spots where someone else needs to use the pavement!!

Developing processes that minimize competition for space.

Don't even know where to start on this one. My experience is in Washington County and some in City of Portland. Many routes are narrow roads with very high traffic volumes making biking a difficult alternative. Often streets with bike lanes also carry the most traffic - prefer to have bike routes with much less traffic. Much work to do here in the region.

Encourage riding by middle-aged and older riders by providing incentives and/or special facilities when appropriate - consider Amsterdam as a model.

Enforcement of the rules of the road for bicyclists, walkers, and drivers. Drivers would be more friendly to cyclists and walkers if they were held to the same standards, had to know the rules and would receive consequences when they don't adhere to them.

Focus on sidewalks, not bike lanes. Especially connect neighborhoods surrounding schools to the schools with safe walking paths... and then make the poor dears walk 1/2 mile to 1 mile instead of expensive, polluting bus service.

Funding must not be regressive.

Getting people out of cars and being safe doing it should be a human right and will help fight obesity as a benefit.

Heck yeah more biking and / or smarter biking. There also needs to be a bike lane going over the hill. In CO they put a bike lane on climbs and let down hill bikes take the lane. This would make a lot on sense on Cornell.

Keep investment balanced with all transportation alternatives.

Make car and truck movement a priority.

Make safe bicycle routes that have physical barriers from traffic, not just painted lines. The kicker is that these bike-ways must also be in areas where people want to go/get to. Putting "scenic bikeways" that go way out of the way people are going makes little sense.
Making these activities safer and more convenient does not require gold plated 12 foot wide walking paths and vehicle sizes bike lanes. Bikes only need wider or separate lanes if the adjacent traffic travels greater than 45 mph.

Need more convenient alternatives to single occupancy vehicles. Need reduction in transportation volume, and need to reduce greenhouse gases, and need to make folks fitter.

No more bike paths on roads that are not suited for it. Focus on off-street bike paths, ped connections. Ensure that all new dev't takes access to transit into consideration.

Not always taking away from car routes (i.e., removing lanes on busy streets).

Not at the expense of better roads for cars.

Not making auto travel more difficult - use flashing cross lights instead of full stop lights, or give the person crossing two options (bike/walk or fast/slow) - it doesn't take cyclists, runners or most walkers more than 5-10 seconds to cross, but the lights stay on for 30 seconds or more - very frustrating.

Only once we have full access to mass transit and our roads are repaired.

Pathways and pedestrian signal flashers have helped in my neighborhood to access Bethany Village for the library, Walgreens, QFC, dentist and doctor via bike and walking.

Pathways between neighborhoods even if gated would be a start. Sidewalks, and trails to schools would also be helpful though I know this is taking place in some places.

Pay for the land taken from homeowners and businesses to make new trails and bike paths. DO NOT assume that the land will be donated or taken for below market cost.

Reducing car traffic; reducing environmental pollution; reducing car traffic congestion; addressing climate change.

Relatively low priority. I envision walking as primarily a recreational use. Biking is at least 50% recreational, a lower priority than transportation to work.

See previous response where some of this is covered in the comments section.

Separate bike and walking paths.

Sidewalks are a must on routes to schools and/or school buses.

Sidewalks first and foremost, everywhere!!! I can't walk my street for fear of getting hit by a car, and my son can't walk to his friend's neighborhood a 1/4 mile away!

Sidewalks should be mandatory for all new developments. Bicycle paths that are physically-separated from auto lanes is the only thing that will truly get people onto bikes for daily errands.

The town center concept has worked and needs to be continued. new construction should always be required to provide a walkable environment.
There is a need to separate serious cyclists, commuters, and fast movers from casual users and pedestrians. Pedestrian and cycle ways need to be isolated from autos. Continuity of such ways are important. They should not be fragmented.

Where are people trying to get to.

Greater emphasis on sidewalks in east pdx rather than bike lanes. Too many busy roads lacking sidewalks.

How much money would be spent and how would the funds be raised. WE ARE ALREADY HEAVILY TAXED.

I do not support making biking more convenient in the outer suburbs (e.g. east of 82nd). We have so many neighborhoods that still need basic street paving and sidewalks or additional lighting. Actually get around to building sidewalks that were planned more than 30 years ago but never funded.

In east county, we have a few more sidewalks but still not many. Most bus stops are well designed but getting to them over gravel, mud and debris can be difficult.

In rural suburban areas, sidewalks are not frequent and the shoulders of the roads are uneven and full of holes. We don’t need all sidewalks but having a safe place to walk is important.

Instead of improving areas that already have some biking and walking infrastructure, focus on those areas with no sidewalks or bike paths.

Population, congestion, tourism and safety.

Putting in sidewalks will make it safer to walk; adding bikeways or bike paths will increase the number of bikers in my area - east county.

Safe storage for bikes.

Sidewalks should be a priority in all areas of Portland--at least on one side of the street.

Unless they are ACTUAL benefits, they should not be considered. Potential benefits are a blank check to do whatever you want with the simple explanation being, "well, we think it might do one of those things...."

Walking would be great, but we need to stop catering to the cyclists. That is one of the reasons that I am moving out of Multnomah county. I am tired of cyclists in the road all the time. If you would like to give them their own side walk lane that would be great, but stop messing up the streets for the rest of us. We have wasted way too much money on useless "improvements" for the cyclists.

Wise use of money and skills and abilities.

Good bicycle and pedestrian facilities create stronger communities. Many people who would prefer to bike and/or walk instead of drive are reluctant to do so due to the stress of being immersed in increasing automobile traffic. Lowering speed limits, diverting car traffic, and making it all around less convenient to drive than walk or bike on city streets would improve the health and happiness of our communities. Also, separated paths dedicated to pedestrians and bicyclists along major arterials would encourage more people to leave their cars behind on longer excursions.
Usually there are one or a few "choke points" that are hazardous and unpleasant in a walk or bike route. Concentrate on changing those places so that a full journey can be consistently safe and desirable.

We need to make biking and walking a lot more safe and efficient. Connecting the existing bike lanes and sidewalks to transit and other facilities is a great way to start.

Add sidewalks on the East side areas without them.

All of the above. It is the right thing to do to reduce our oil dependency and to reduce GHG emissions.

Area roads have plenty of space that can be used for dedicated bike lanes. Bikes need separation from cars and cars need to be slowed in order to increase biking convenience and comfort. Remove parking or travel lanes from cars where necessary to accomplish this.

Beyond what I said before (e.g. both sides, continuous and direct) pedestrian right-of-way should be maintained to the same level that vehicle right-of-way is maintained, even during development of adjacent private property. In other words: both sides, continuous and direct should only be impacted while actual work is going on, never 24/7.

Build more sidewalks in outer southeast Portland. Build more grocery stores that people can walk to in that area.

Getting rid of gaps for safe travel, such as lack of sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes that suddenly end in busy locations.

Attention to outer areas of the city.

Give walking more attention. overgrown, uneven and blocked (construction mostly) pedestrian rights of way are a real impediment.

How to separate cars and bikes as much as possible

I walk in my neighborhood a lot, and I know which zebra crosswalks are dangerous and which drivers pay attention to. Do you know why that is true? I don't, but certain crosswalks are certainly dangerous and drivers don't pay attention. I think education is crucial – I've had drivers lecture me for trying to cross with a walk signal when they are trying to make a right turn. Also bicycle drivers do not follow the rules. They almost never slow down for pedestrians. Perhaps a program at school and billboard warnings. The Trimet bus warning – don't let lol become doa – was really effective for my granddaughter who had a new cell phone. In my opinion bicycle riders go much too fast in bicycle paths. I like the narrow streets with parking on both sides. Cars and bikes have to go slow.

I'd focus on missing connections in key places in the city -- getting across Naito, walking connections that force pedestrians two blocks out of there way (NE 16th by Lloyd Center). When I'm walking, I'm like water, I try to find the shortest way and while I'm willing to go a bit further out of my bike, it's not a lot more.

Make bikes safely coexist with cars.

Safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
Safety is important, but convenience is the key to attracting new riders (at least from the perspective of someone who commutes by bike year-round).

Safety. is there a way to create separate paths for bikes/ peds that have minimal conflicts with cars.

Start with areas that have no sidewalks like Raleigh Hills.

Stop over engineering solutions for bike and peds. The south waterfront is a great example. The two way MUP is great until you get to the base of the Gibb St. Ped bridge and OHSU. At this point it becomes a huge mess of arrows and lights and no one follows it. Think peds/bikes are like water they will take the easiest path not the best path.

The safer it is to bike, the more people will do so.

There should be major routes for bikes that are protected bike lanes. Like having a lane on burnside soley dedicated to bikes with actual barriers to protect the lane.

Walking safely should be emphasized-- it is criminal that so many neighborhoods do not have sidewalks, good crosswalks. While I am an avid cyclist, the priority needs to be on pedestrian improvements and not more bike improvements-- until pedestrian improvements are made.

What percent of the total adult population actually bikes regularly.

Build safe sidewalks and safe bike lanes. Remember that a lot of pedestrians are trying to push strollers with their kids in them, and need level sidewalks.

Enact the Idaho law of not requiring a cyclist to stop completely at every stop sign when the road is clearly open both ways. Ticket cyclists that break the laws.

more bike capacity on light rail trains. smoother sidewalks. (As a wheelchair user I can't begin to tell you how difficult and downright PAINFUL it is to use some of the sidewalks in Portland, especially in areas with large tree roots pushing up blocks of concrete).

Projects that connect the most potential riders/walkers to the larger transportation system.

Pulling cyclist off of busy streets with inadequate space for bike lanes. Syncing cross street ped/cycle lights to keep traffic moving. Greater enforcement of traffic laws for cyclist.

The fact that we have high traffic streets without sidewalks is ridiculous.

Biking and walking cannot be about how many miles of bike paths we have. You need to pay attention when a bike path isn't safe--like Powell Blvd., for instance.

Expanding bike lanes and sidewalks to include furthest reaches of east Multnomah county and the surrounding communities; expect developers of new housing communities to plan, if not pay for, bike lanes and sidewalks on the major arteries that buyers will use to get to their new homes.
I am all for Bikes, but we spend a lot of city money on bike lanes, etc. I feel that bicyclists should be registered and licensed just like motorists. They are using a lot of the road, why should they also not pay for it. I also feel that peace officers need to enforce bike laws and ticket law breakers. As a pedestrian who was injured by a bicyclist and a driver who has seen and experienced really bad choices made by bicyclists that have put me, others and themselves at great danger, it's time we considered this.

I live in outer SE Portland and work by Emmanuel. There should be more sidewalks/bikelanes connecting transportation routes on the eastside neighborhoods before more bike lanes go in in north/northeast. It further disenfranchises the families displaced by the gentrification of the inner ne neighborhoods. They do not have safe access to get their families to the store. Speaking of which can we get a trader joes in outer se? If they pulled from ne because of gentrification concerns maybe they could improve the se selection of grocery store (food desert).

Sidewalks and walking paths definitely but no more bike lanes until the pedestrians are safely able to get wherever they need to. So walking would be number 1.

Focus on East Portland!

"Destinations" (shopping, schools, parks, libraries, etc.) that could have shorter, direct pedestrian connections. These don't need to be expensive, engineered sidewalks. The gravel paths that SWTrails has build in the SWNI area (Southwest Portland) for a few hundred dollars are still quite serviceable with essentially no maintenance after 15 years.

Bike infrastructure separate from traffic. Many intersections should have crossing signals that stop traffic in all directions when pedestrians are crossing.

Biking and walking routes are always coupled in your questions. They are two different modes and not used by congruent populations. The very young and the old walk and those in between walk. Also, the bike routes are out among vehicular traffic and not accessible to walkers. The walking routes on on paths and sidewalks not accessible, for most urban purposes, to bikes.

Biking and walking should be safe but cyclists should be required to take a safety course and there should be a small sales tax or fee on the sale of all bicycles to pay for trail/pathway construction and improvements.

Biking lanes need to be separate from traffic. Make biking and walking more accessible and safe for children, the elderly and low income communities. Develop land use so that biking and walking can be a regularly used form of transportation.

Connections of existing infrastructure (Gibbs Street Bridge), Hawthorne Bridge to downtown, etc.

Creating and maintaining separation between riders, walkers and vehicle traffic. Bike riders need to follow the rules of the road and those rules should be enforced.
Currently the share the road policy has placed bike infrastructure (bike lanes) on the roads. Automobiles quickly degrade the paint requiring more maintenance than would be required if the bikes had their own paths. This calls into question the wisdom of implementing bike infrastructure. Instead, share the road should be considered a stop gap, and separate bike/pedestrian/car modes should be the focus for future development.

Educate drivers so they will stop thinking of bicyclists and walkers as the enemy. Put bike lanes everywhere. Stop the endless experiments with bike lanes, boxes, green spaces, etc -- all that accomplishes is confusion on everyone's part. Give tickets to drivers who endanger bicyclists and walkers. Create more sidewalks and traffic lights. Walkers and bicyclists need to be able to cross the street safely.

Everyone should be able to walk to local establishments safely and with a certain degree of ease. Give pedestrians priority. We're ignored as we sit for minutes waiting for a light to change so we can cross the street!

However, the areas that need improvement are not getting it. Sidewalks are being added in areas that don't connect instead of focusing on areas that are needed. It seems like it is a waste of money painting chevrons on the road, especially every 50 ft when there are no streets intersections.

I want to move through my community on a human scale. If the infrastructure is there, I will use it - at the same time, reducing my dependence on the automobile. Active transportation is good for me, my health, the community's health and the overall economy.

In addition to great bike lanes and walking pathways, there needs to be much more education of safe use. As a daily bicyclist I'm frustrated and disappointed in the increasing dangerous behavior of my fellow cyclists. All cyclists need to be accountable for their safety, and how it affects others.

Invest first where the density of potential pedestrians and cyclists is greatest.

It's a sad reality that walking is inconvenient at best, and extremely dangerous at worst, for a large majority of trips in our city. So let's stop the car-centric juggernaut and give the streets back to people for the health of our bodies, our environment, and our souls.

Low-income neighborhoods.

Prioritize areas that don't yet have sidewalks, walking paths, etc. Lower priority to updating/maintaining existing sidewalks, walking paths. Also focus on areas with high density of families/kids.

Same comment as before. I lived in Eugene during my college years and it was amazing to be able to get anywhere in the area via bike or walking by using the bike/pedestrian loop that connects most of the city. That path also connects Eugene to Springfield--brilliant! Riding on roads was kept to a minimum and was actually an enjoyable, therapeutic thing instead of gladiator blood sport that it is here in PDX.

Sidewalks in sw pdx connecting 'trails.'

Sidewalks on Fairmount Blvd.
Somehow there needs to be a way to get bikes off pedestrian walkways in areas where there are not bike lanes. I'm tired of bikers taking right-of-way on the sidewalk and nearly running over the walkers!

The safer it is to ride a bike, the more people will do it. Ways to get both motorists and cyclists to respect the presence and rights of pedestrians. Too many motorists don't look for pedestrians, and too many cyclists run red lights even when there are pedestrians crossing with walk signs.

Ways to reduce car vs bicycle antagonism: more separation of the two modes; more enforcement of traffic laws by bicyclists; more education of motorists to safely share the road.

We need to be creative and bold! Let's build separate facilities in downtown. We need sidewalks in west portland.

We need to ensure pedestrian walk ways and cycling lanes are clearly marked and available. Areas with no sidewalk or shoulder on the roadway need to be amended while at the same same planting more road-side trees for shade and co2remediation.

While sharing the road is good in theory, the size and speed of vehicles ways dominates. Some roads/paths should be for non motorized use only. Further, when these are highly used, they should be marked with lanes for pedestrians vs bikes, skates, etc.

Ageing of community and region, funding, and citizen input (especially younger citizens).

Clear out transient campers on Springwater Corridor, more lighting along sidewalks and trails, more police presence in Lents.

Effects on all transportation modalities.

It's silly that the rules about skateboarding (etc.) on sidewalks are different in Downtown than they are everywhere else. Letting the Clean And Safe employees bike on the sidewalk but ticketing skateboard commuters for using the sidewalk sends a conflicting message, discourages skateboard commuting, and makes people wonder why uniformed folks get to break the rules.

Putting flashing lights for high traffic crosswalks. Safety of students who cross the street to either walk home or to get to their parents cars.

Safe, bike corridors.

Safety for the walkers and cyclists. Also, making crossings highly visible with caution signs for motorists. I've seen walkers and bicyclists enter the road without waiting to see if autos will stop, so the responsibility goes both ways.

The answer is NOT always more sidewalks. I favor walks/paths not next to the street that are suitable for both bikes and walking..
This is an easy, relatively cheap, and lower-maintenance option to increase the resiliency of our transportation network. This should be the highest priority.

60,000 people live in the unincorporated area between Gladstone and Milwaukie, but installation of sidewalks & curbs in this area is non-existent in many blocks. There should be a plan for correcting this. If it can't all be done in one year, the timeline priorities should be published, so political pressure doesn't determine who gets a sidewalk & curb next year. Also, any new sidewalk should be wide enough for two wheel chairs to pass each other.

Add sidewalks to established neighborhoods in unincorporated Clackamas County! If a bike lane disappears half way down a road, bike commuters won't use it because it's not safe. Use street sweepers at busy intersections when accidents happen, or bike riders get flat tires. This is expensive and time consuming and discourages people from bike commuting. Build bike paths someplace beautiful -- not through the industrial park or along loud and busy I-205, but along rivers and in quieter areas away from traffic.

Bikers and pedestrians need to be more aware of the need to follow the laws, just as drivers must do.

Can part of this be providing incentives to employers to improve bike parking, lockers, and shower facilities for commuters? Increase the number of bikeways like Ankeny and Clinton. These efficient routes parallel busy streets, have few stop signs and have minimal auto traffic. In the best scenario there is a complete and parallel network of bikeways along major auto thoroughfares.

Consider this when builders want to put up storefronts--are the intended occupants of those stores businesses that people in those neighborhoods need. For example, if there is a grocery store, a bank, several restaurants, salons, etc. near each neighborhood in smaller shopping centers and there are good walking/biking routes there from the surrounding neighborhoods and good bike parking infrastructure there for parking, then more people will use those businesses. If you just build huge shopping malls on the outskirts of places where there are 5 of every kind of business, then you pretty much guarantee that folks will have to drive there.

Do not reinvent the wheel. Utilize the right tools for the right location ranging from shared use paths, bike lanes, and simple sidewalk connections to reduce difficult access.

Encourage walking and biking to schools.

Make such improvements first in the areas with the greatest payback potential (i.e., those largest segments of the public which would benefit).

Making walkways desirable.

Pave all the streets first! Put in sidewalks. This is basic stuff! Concentrate on doing this first.

Safety on sidewalks may also include street lights-- especially in areas where there are no sidewalks!
Separating pedestrians from other forms of travel. Trees or other barriers between sidewalk and street lanes.

Sidewalks and walking/bike paths are good, but not at the expense of mature trees. Mature trees should be saved at all costs.

This is HUGELY important in part because of all the health and quality of life benefits. We need to see a significant increase in creatively using existing rights of way for walking and biking, increase the feeling of protection and safety through separation, and also pursue off-street trails and selecting certain streets for lower speeds.

Walking needs more attention.

Everyone should have access to a sidewalk. If a car can travel on it, a sidewalk should also be on it (except highways). Lighting and crosswalks are musts.

Shift focus to walking first. Pedestrian safety will benefit cyclists also, along w/ transit users. Shift cyclists off of major auto arterials as much as possible.

Does it make biking safer for all groups? Does it make walking safer?

Safety for people using the biking & walking trails without becoming unnecessarily aggressive against poorer income brackets.

Bike paths along interstates and better sidewalks. More lighted crosswalks.

Making clear and open bike lanes that don’t interfere with drivers.

Bike lanes are great! I use them all the time. I’m only frustrated when I find a road with a bike lane that ends after a few miles, forcing me to take a longer route to where I’m going or to use the sidewalks. Bike lanes should connect to other bike lanes as often as possible.

Getting people to be active and walk is key in the health of our people. It would be good to put grocery type stores close to people so that it is not always a get in the car and drive situation. Safe walking and biking paths or ways could help with this.

Make walking safer by making bicyclists more aware of pedestrians!

Real connections that allow people to travel into and through the area and then a good information dissemination system that makes it easy to understand and use. Remember that they can be used for a variety of purposes if done well ie getting to work, exercising, getting outdoors, establishing a car-free vision.
State laws force bicyclists to ride "as far right as possible". Riding at the edge of the lane contributes to the #1 cause of collisions (failure of motorists to yield while turning) and the #1 cause of fatality (unsafe passing of motorists). As per data from traffic collision studies, the biggest increase to cycling safety can occur when the state law allows cyclists to take the center of the lane or to ride along the left tire track as motorcyclists are taught to do. This increases visibility from hooks, and forces motorists to change lanes if they want to pass (again, passing within the lane or lanesplitting to pass are the #1 cause of fatality). These studies and further info can be found at: http://corvallisrightofway.com/causes-of-collisions/data/ and http://corvallisrightofway.com/causes-of-collisions/1-cause-of-fatalities-3-cause-of-collisions.

Bikes need to be separated from pedestrians and cars if the street is at all busy. There need to be dedicated bike paths that get bicyclists from neighborhood to neighborhood and even across town.

Business, education, and citizens' pleasure needs/desires.

Bikes should pay there share of hard surface costs. Keep paths separate from cars and urban sidewalk retail. Consider setbacks for commerce and some active lane. For example in waterfront, have a set of fast and slow lanes to avoid conflicts.

Serving the needs of populations with limited resources. Also, restricting or placing limits on opportunities to drive short distances where investments in walking and biking are made.

We need to invest in low-income communities and communities of color.

Cost to lower middle and lower income families.

Designated bike lanes, bike boxes at intersections, reduce width of vehicle travel lanes to ten feet, implement traffic calming measures, cross walks, lead pedestrian interval at signals, bike parking.

Planning to refocus communities on their neighborhood cores instead of a major metropolitan focus with bedroom communities as suburbs.

These options are great but focus should be given to high density dynamic route options. As for walking high focus on connecting sidewalks where no sidewalks exist should be a priority. Sidewalks are required around new construction and at school bus stops (clark county) but that often leaves disconnected walkways.

Please consider the fact that you are dramatically impacting people's commutes when you slow traffic down on the high crash corridors. Consider the fact that there are equity issues with bringing more bike lanes to poor areas where people do not bike much and that sometimes it's reflective of gentrification, not the needs of the residents that are getting pushed out.

Zoning to encourage dense developments near mass transit centers.

Safety of using walking and bike paths. For example, Hiway 99 in Hazel Dell is a very scary place to try and cross the street even with lights and crosswalks. I could walk to the food and drug stores from my home, but refuse to risk crossing Hiway 99. It only takes one bad driver to kill or maim an innocent person, and it happens on this road each year.
The most basic forms of transportation should be completed before capacity expansion for automobiles is considered any further. Basic, safe transportation is a need. Added capacity and reduced delay for automobiles is a want. Needs should always come before wants.

Despite all the "awards" for being bike friendly, I find it extraordinarily intimidating to travel by bicycle through designated bike roads. Bike paths with under and over passes are much preferred. Something needs to be done to protect sidewalks for walking/running. Too many businesses have placed signs and facilities on the sidewalk making them a hazard to pedestrians of all speeds.

CRIME!!!

I think having consistent bike lanes and sidewalks is important.

Not reducing vehicle lanes to implement bike lanes. That causes more congestion.

Needs and trends.

Work with developers so more width is dedicated to biking or separate bike lanes (like Europe) so safety is considered for new developments. On existing consider safety above cost.

People should get out and walk or bike more. In some cases it takes about the same amount of time. But will people walk or bike? Most people don't even consider not getting in their car, but they should!

Sidewalks should be given the priority followed by walking and to a lesser extent bicycle paths

1. Build a Cycle-track between The Rose Quarter and OMSI in conjunction with light rail (see transit proposals above). 2. Build the Sullivan's Gulch Trail 3. Build a Seventh Avenue bike bridge over I-84.

85% walking 15% biking.

A qualified yes - emphasis on safety.


Again, open up dead end streets, at least with passageways for cyclists and pedestrians, so they don't have so far to go. More protected bike lanes and green boxes, especially in suburban areas like unincorporated Washington County, Beaverton and Tigard. (Now, the bike lanes stop as soon as one leaves Portland and enters Washington County. Ugh).

Again, safety from crime.

Bikes have very limited access to the roadways and autos don't give room.

Biking is the easiest way to reduce traffic congestion, however traffic planners constantly place bikers in physical harm with stupid intersection conflicts. Why do they allow cars to make right hand turns up to the instant the pedestrian signal turns white?

But in balance with other modes of public transportation.

Connectivity that is consistent across the area. Having partial completed efforts make the overall program non-functional.
Consider how to add safe biking with accommodating the majority of commuters and business/manufacturing related traffic. They should go together...not to the detriment of many for the interests of the few.

Enforce rules for bike riders too. Use light @ night, obey traffic signals & stop signs etc. No riding on sidewalk.

Focus bike trail investment where it's flat, to better encourage getting people into biking.

For everybody. also consider housing affordability in parallel.

Have bicyclist help pay their share by licensing or other methods. Set up a dedicated funds for this policies.

However, I think walking should take precedent. We are all pedestrians, whereas biking is only going to serve a certain population.

I am frequently dodging cars and cyclists at intersections. Make intersections safer. Pedestrians should be a priority. Everybody is a pedestrian at some point.

I would build sidewalks for pedestrians before adding any bike routes. There are plenty of bike routes, & not enough sidewalks for pedestrians. Sidewalks are a higher priority.

Increase bike paths not on the roads. Provide outreach for bicycle safety and rules. The West side Willamette needs to go all the way through to the Sellwood Bridge.

Increase the number of cyclists; make biking to work easier. Create a public awareness campaign about pedestrian safety.

Keeping bikes off the highway.

Make paths and connections wheelchair accessible.

Make walking routes cleaner and safer - e.g., garbage, homeless encampments.

Making our pedestrian safe and separated from auto traffic.

More and better bike paths, separated from auto traffic where possible that make bicycling feel safe to more people.

More emphasis on walking like where sidewalks are missing.

Neighborhood streets should be for local traffic, bikes and pedestrians ONLY! Vancouver BC neighborhood streets are designed to deter "shortcutting" and speeding on residential streets AND IT WORKS! Set the ball in motion!

No new taxes or fees.

Our 1st priority is better roads for cars so would not want to take money away from that for instance for more bike lanes.

Particularly in St. Johns, East Portland, and cully/parkrose. Investment must be equitable. The rich Portland of areas already have enough. Also, public transit first.

Practicality, some streets were constructed with no thought of putting in sidewalks, just have ditches that can't be covered.
Prioritize bicycling and walking by building safe and convenient facilities for travelling - such as bike racks (and place them closest to building entrances), separated bike lanes and paths, wide sidewalks, easy crossings with enough signal time to actually cross the entire street, and bike sharing.

Prioritize pedestrian over bikes.

Push back from car drivers who will resent losing the priority status they have enjoyed until recently. Possibly more car congestion caused by loss of lanes or parking to create more walking/biking areas.

Safe and convenient biking and walking requires safe roads and trails. We need more cooperation with the cities and road maintenance agencies to keep roads and trails clean, to keep them well marked/striped and lit at night, and well signed. There is also the climate we are in- most people are not willing to ride and walk in the dark, cold, wet, and tree debris littered streets. If sidewalks and bike lanes were regularly cleaned and if there were reflectors and more visible stop signs and cross walks this would be a good improvement. Also training drivers- so many drivers come to a stop sign and don't even look to the right when they turn right, they only look left. We need more cooperation with the police department and DMV to make driving rules more publicized and practiced.

Safer alternatives to 99w.

Safety.

Safety equity across regions equity among modes of transit.

Sidewalks. SW Portland needs sidewalks. Dedicated bike trails.

Start with filling gaps.

The idea of "cars as guests" on neighborhood streets would be nice. If routes aren't safe from start to finish we can't grow our cycling and walking rates. Writing laws to bring tougher penalties for striking cyclists and pedestrians - like 6 months license suspension.

The vehicle codes need to change to take bike out of the mix with cars. They are not the same and should not be expected to follow the same rules of the road as cars. We don't really need more bike paths we need better laws to protect the cyclist.

Those of us who are unable to use bicycles for transportation are forced to give up our areas for driving to give bicyclists the right o way which they abuse.
Transportation routes should be developed that streamline long distance cycling to jobs similar to the interstate and state freeway systems in place for cars. Off road paths such as the Springwater Corridor give bicycles the lowest priority as evidenced by yield to pedestrian signs. On public roadways, bicycles are restricted to the margins (2-3 feet) and considered a lowest priority in the hierarchy of road users. It's a losing proposition for cyclists on either path or road system. Fortunately, cars have access to interstates that restrict all other modes of transportation. Similar systems could be developed for cyclists, skateboards, and other human powered transportation modes across the city via protected cycle tracks and/or along existing railways and light rail lines (i.e. the lightrail tracks through Sullivan's Gulch along I-84).

We need more community information on the rules of the road. I had an employee that wanted to bike to work but we could not find the rules of the road and doubted drivers new what bikers supposed to do and consequently how to react to bikers.

Who wouldn't support this.

Work toward reducing the space that automobiles use in favor of sidewalks... slow cars down.

Working with the neighborhood associations.

Would also make our area more beautiful!

Yes that is sound basis for all local travel.

Yes, however, I note that money has been spent to reduce W. Everett to only one auto lane from two in order to add a dedicated bike lane. I think vehicular traffic density on W. Everett was high enough with two lanes to preclude such a reduction in traffic capacity. Also, I think that all bicycles should be licensed in order to generate revenue to help offset the high expenditures on bicycle-specific projects.

1. Build a Cycle-track between The Rose Quarter and OMSI in conjunction with light rail (see transit proposals above). 2. Build the Sullivan's Gulch Trail 3. Build a Seventh Avenue bike bridge over I-84.

Absolutely getting bikes onto safe alternatives. Example: NO bikes should be on Hawthorne Blvd.'s narrow lanes. It is so dangerous to bikers and drivers. Madison and Clay should be alternatives in this example with bikers only allowed to CROSS Hawthorne, not drive on it. BIKERS SHOULD BE LICENSED like all drivers. Then, the few driving at night w/o lights (so scary) or going thr stop signs could be ticketed like other flagrant violaters - and they would be contributine revenue to bike paths.


Again, safety from crime.

Any funding should not be on the back of motor vehicle users or property owners.

As before.

Bene.

Better signage indicating recommended bike routes; encourage cyclists to wear reflective clothing and helmets and use lights.
Climate change is going to drive millions of Californians north. Consider ways that would make biking safer for families and children especially cycle tracks.

Cost.

Cully, Parkrose, etc. Painting a line down the side of 82nd does NOT a bike path make. Divert vehicular traffic onto main arteries so that neighborhoods are safer.

Dedicated lanes for bikes, preferably separated from motor traffic. Enforcement of existing laws governing bicyclists.

Dollars to support more sidewalks or bike paths should come from a fund designated exclusively for that.

Equity.

Every urban road needs these improvements but I wouldn't focus first on the poorer areas and very unwalkable places.

Focus bike trail investment where it's flat, to better encourage getting people into biking.

Focus, focus, focus.

For everybody. also consider housing affordability in parallel.

Given that we can all do our parts in this very critical issues, cost of living kept getting higher almost everyday. We as people need to consider Oregon power centralized in Oregon not in Washington. Simply because we are Oregonians and it means a lot.

Have bicyclist help pay their share by licensing or other methods. Set up a dedicated funds for this policies.

However, I think walking should take precedent. We are all pedestrians, whereas biking is only going to serve a certain population.

I am amazed at the lack of proper sidewalks in the Hillsboro area. Also, I am afraid that the price of adding new sidewalks will fall onto the homeowner. I have seen sidewalks put into a new church, but it's on a country road with NO sidewalks...this does not make sense. As for biking, I did it 6 times and thought I was going to get hit by cars. My outfit was bright yellow and coming to work sweaty and needing a shower is not appropriate for the office.

I don't care about the bicycles, but we don't have paved sidewalks on either side of Halsey out where we live, so it is difficult for people to walk to services even if they want to hike the distance. Paved sidewalks should be standard on major streets!

Keeping bikes off the highway.

Making sure it doesn't come at the lessening of roads for cars. This is the North West, it's fricking wet and cold half the year. Bikes can't solve everything.

Mode separation - establish principal bike facilities away from major arterial streets. Complete sidewalk network where redevelopment is unlikely to occur and along transit routes.
More "green boxes" for bikes in the bike lane, expand bike paths such as the spring water corridor, and safer bike lanes.

More emphasis on walking like where sidewalks are missing.

Neighborhood streets should be for local traffic, bikes and pedestrians ONLY! Vancouver BC neighborhood streets are designed to deter "shortcutting" and speeding on residential streets AND IT WORKS! Set the ball in motion!

Night and poorly lighted pathways.

Our 1st priority is better roads for cars so would not want to take money away from that for instance for more bike lanes.

Physically separated bike facilities on main arterial routes are desperately needed. In many cases, this will necessitate the re-allocation of roadway from motor vehicle storage or throughput, but it must be done if we wish to achieve the benefits listed here. Planned bicycle facilities must also be as convenient or more convenient than motor vehicle facilities if we are to convince people to choose cycling over driving. Putting all bicycle facilities on side-streets (away from final destinations such as shopping, businesses, schools, ect.) must not continue. We must also stop planning and installing bicycle facilities which weave around and require pre-planning so as not to get lost or dumped onto a major street with no safe place to ride; this incentivizes driving a car, as motor vehicle routes are everywhere and require little to no forethought before heading to a destination.

Prioritize pedestrian over bikes.

Push back from car drivers who will resent losing the priority status they have enjoyed until recently. Possibly more car congestion caused by loss of lanes or parking to create more walking/biking areas.

Reduce toxic gasses by urging vehicles to remove pound advertising from car dealer advertising rectangles covering license plates. Punting a pound with a car consumes everything: oxygen-fuel-tires-brakes-pavement-tax dollars. Consuming this stuff makes toxic gasses and guck down storm drain. Bicyclers need oxygen and pavement.

Safer alternatives to 99w.

Safety.

Safety but don't go crazy with lightning.

Safety equity across regions equity among modes of transit.

See comment above.

Separate bike paths from vehicle traffic to ensure safety and encourage more people to ride. Increase curb cuts - many corners still do not have them.

Serving under-served areas and connectivity.
Sidewalks should be on both sides of every surface street and funded by property owners/developers. Bike paths should utilize non-roadway corridors and should be paid for solely by bike riders.

Sidewalks. SW Portland needs sidewalks. Dedicated bike trails.

Start with filling gaps.

That there are huge differences between pedestrian needs and biking needs. This metro region is pretty bike friendly but it's not very walkable.

The idea of "cars as guests" on neighborhood streets would be nice. If routes aren't safe from start to finish we can't grow our cycling and walking rates. Writing laws to bring tougher penalties for striking cyclists and pedestrians - like 6 months license suspension.

The total transportation package which includes: -roads/freeways to allow trucks to deliver the just in time inventory to retail outlets and deliver the overnight package ordered by Metro area residents be it bike parts, walking shoes, Frisbees, foods stuffs etc. to their residence.

The vehicle codes need to change to take bike out of the mix with cars. They are not the same and should not be expected to follow the same rules of the road as cars. We don't really need more bike paths we need better laws to protect the cyclist.

There should be no areas within 1/2 mile of school that are not passable by sidewalks.

Those of us who are unable to use bicycles for transportation are forced to give up our areas for driving to give bicyclists the right of way which they abuse.

Try to build a better more cohesive biking community by engaging with safety amongst cars and cyclist but also cyclist to each other.

Users should help support this effort; tax on bikes and shoes.

Walking in particular, do an equity assessment on your investments, high income/educational areas are already over invested.

Walking only.

We always build big wide sidewalks on new streets. But leave bike lanes next to fast cars. Look at the new construction for the orange line. Why not put the bike lanes away from the car lanes? Why must bikes be sandwiched between cars going deadly speeds and the door zone? Why cannot bikes be separated like pedestrians. Just move them over.

Who wouldn't support this.

Working with the neighborhood associations.

Yes with a big maybe.

Yes, but not at the point of sacrificing cars.
Yes, however, I note that money has been spent to reduce W. Everett to only one auto lane from two in order to add a dedicated bike lane. I think vehicular traffic density on W. Everett was high enough with two lanes to preclude such a reduction in traffic capacity. Also, I think that all bicycles should be licensed in order to generate revenue to help offset the high expenditures on bicycle-specific projects.

**Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 2:**

1. Fixing and maintaining the roads should be priority one.
2. Already safe enough. Bicycles and the vocal minority is encroaching too much on the method of transport used by most people - cars.
3. Roads should be for motorized vehicles.
4. Why aren’t the bicyclists paying their share?
5. A big part of making biking and walking safe is getting cyclists & pedestrians to look where they’re going, and not step or ride directly in the path of cars, trucks, and buses. When I was a kid, I was taught to look both ways before crossing a street. Now they seem to be taught that they have a right to cross whenever & wherever they want, and traffic just has to stop for them. Well, you can’t fight physics - cars can’t always stop.
6. Bikes need to be licensed to help support themselves.
7. Driving.
8. Make bikes pay for themselves with licenses etc. to pay for bike paths and lanes
9. Biking and walking in Portland is making everyone driving a car unsafe. Both pedestrians and bicyclists disobey the laws and act as if those of us responding to traffic signals are an annoyance. The culture of supporting both these efforts has been one-sided and needs to be changed.
10. Expanded biking investments is for a select few and cost too much for such a meaninglessly small benefit.
11. Invest in our roads and highways.
12. Percentage-wise, very few people walk or ride bike, it is not a cost efficient use of tax payers money.
13. The cost to tax payers and the bad economy.
14. The fact that most office apparel is incompatible with biking. The fact that it’s cold and rainy in the winter. The fact that when jobs are in hubs, you CAN’T make walking a reasonable alternative for people who have busy lives (kids in day care, etc.) so they can’t spend 30 minutes hiking to work.
15. A region that has a climate that limits effective biking or walking to 3 months a year should not invest in it.
16. Biking favors the young and childish at the expense of all.
17. Current policy is adequate.
18. Drivers are forced to pay registration and pay a portion of fuel in taxes. These taxes are supposed to support roadways and safety. Bicyclist PAY NOTHING !!!!!
19. I value safe biking and walking, but I think we’ve overspent vs. the needs. MOney should go elsewhere.
If you've biked in other parts of the country then you know that the Portland area already has a wonderful, and safe, infrastructure in place for people to ride their bikes.

NOT WITH CURRENT FUNDS! Only if LOCAL residents (NOT PORTLAND METRO) vote NEW funds. ie, BEAVERTON or Hillsboro, or THPRD. NOT A METRO wide vote, as that just lets Portland control MY purse strings. THIS is NO LONGER ACCEPTABLE!

The bikes are a hazard on the roads and slow traffic flow. Make the bikers pay for their own bike paths. We need more surface capacity. Improvements for Bike/Pedestrian that can be made as we expand the current system, especially safety improvements should be made.

How will this impact how people actually travel/commute (i.e., automobile traffic).

Iif the bicyclists would obey traffic laws and help pay for improvements maybe i would be more supportive but blowing through stop signs that is a traffic violation but they are above the law.

Bike lanes should be paid for by bikers paying a use fee. Charge for license plates. The entire community shouldn't have to pay for designated bike lanes for just a few people riding bikes.

Semi-rural local community with hiways, roads with no shoulder, etc. I don't want to pay for services that don't benefit my local community.

Bike lanes slow and crowd traffic and make it more dangerous to get around town. Put the money into fixing potholes, and help people get to where they really need to go, safely.

Bike riding is too dangerous on our roads.

I think that what we are doing already is having a positive impact.

What's already available and how much it's used.

Cars travel further and we need room for our trucks to deliver material to our stores so we can keep the shelves stocked. I have never seen a bicycle with a refrigerator or freezer on the back of it. Bicycles carry 1 person while cars can and do carry many more people and families at one time. Also, cars are safer than riding the bicycles.

I do both and feel there is already adequate investment in biking and walking.

Making bike riders pay more....a lot more!!!!!!

Costs.

Bikers are a minority group and they are already well served by taxpayer dollars. Overall walking is already safe. Forget the police and concentrate on the maintenance of what we have.

I do not support additional transportation money for more bike and walking paths. Instead, existing transportation funds should be redirected to these needs.
I think we should stop new projects for 2-3 years and see how the current investments are working out. I know as a driver, that I hate driving in Portland because the bikers and pedestrians seem to think there is no danger crossing intersections without so much as a look at auto traffic. We’ve poured a ton of money into public transit projects in the last ten years, and I think we should measure the actual results against the expected benefits when these were first approved. My bet is that most of them have not lived up to expectations.

Lots of money has already been spent serving this minority segment of the population.

More car lanes.

This helps only a small number of people. Better to spend money on bus and trains.

This is a fine goal but do not increase the level of money spent.

This is worded in an ambiguous way. I believe the majority of our community would like to see the rail path between Lake Oswego and Portland converted into a safe bike/pedestrian path and not reserved for a streetcar.

Bikes pay nothing toward costs, to few ride bikes. Adding routes would not increase ridership.

It would be tough to pay for biking lanes when the roads in our area need repairs.

Look at reality of usage, not at hopes and dreams of advocates of biking in the rain.

Again, portland has already over-invested in this area.

Use existing funds for existing needs rather than wasting it on "beautification" projects, Freeway on ramp Stop lights which makes commuting WORSE by backing up traffic trying to enter the freeway while not bringing down the congestion on the freeway, not taking out bond debts that costs taxpayers more than half of our outrageously high 30cent per gallon gas taxes just to pay the interests on, allow citizens and volunteers to do our own road repairs and signage at a cost savings instead of INSISTING it all has to be done by ODOT officials through complicated and expensive channels.

Again, this does not address the needs of those of us who live on the edges of the UGB - this will not encourage any of us to walk or bike because getting to public transit is so difficult and then the commute is so long.

Again, this survey seems to presuppose the inherent value of the endeavor, which I deeply question. What is the cost benefit of spending the money on bike paths versus road improvements? I have heard multiple stories of the need for road maintenance funds -- I’d rather have my scarce resources go towards keeping the roads functional instead of adding little-used walking paths to work.

Bike riders do not pay any gas tax, they should not get better anything until the roads are fixed.

Current level is acceptable.

Do not use road transportation funds and tax money for bike lanes, until bike fees pay their own way.

Mobility of ALL people, not just greenies!
Those that use should pay the cost.

Virtually most any dollars for PED and Bike infrastructure should come from all other funding sources and not from highway and road dollars.

We have plenty of bike and walking paths. Our needed infrastructure is crumbling due to the foolish overspending on luxuries. The cyclists feel that the laws of physics have been suspended just for them, resulting in deadly accidents.

Funds should come from user fees and not the gas tax.

Biking and walking are already safe in my community. Portland is overpopulated and the car/bike mix is only going to get worse. Picture a street in Bombay.

It seems like more is spent on bikes than on roads and bikers pay no fees.

Our observation is that many (MANY...maybe MOST) bicycle riders in the chore area feel "privileged" to ignore traffic signs and signals, riding two, three and sometimes four abreast on urban streets and county roads. In the deep east county where we call home they come in SWARMS, riding sometimes 5 abreast on narrow, 2-lane, shoulder-less county roads, creating serious traffic hazards and delays. And, of course, if one of them is injured, it is ALWAYS the tax-paying motorist who is to blame. NO money for bikes (and I ride one, but now in the way described!).

Taxes! Bikers should pay their share.

There has been plenty of bike and pedestrian investment already. Please, for the love god; focus on commuting times rather than another bike trail and business setbacks from sidewalks.

Biking is a juvenile answer to solving transportation problems and it does nothing in this regard. Bikes are a road hazard and have no business being on the highway. Most countries provide off highway bike paths which is where they should be. To think bicycles would have any impact on environmental quality is absurd.

My community (Tualatin) has loads of sidewalks that are safe to walk on. Instead, people walk down the middle of the street. Wasting money on building more sidewalks for pedestrians to LOOK AT while walking in the middle of the street solves nothing.

State, city and county organizations already are pouring massive money into bike trails and networks. METRO should not add more gas to this blaze of public spending.

Bicycles contribute nothing to the immense cost of infrastructure that has been dedicated to them. I am a cyclist, but I don't think it is equitable to spend so much on bicycle infrastructure without those who use it contributing as cars do through gas tax.

I would only support this if the dollars came from somewhere else than transportation/gas tax dollars. How about taxing bicycles to pay for bike lanes?
If more bike paths are to be constructed, it must not be at the expense of the free movement of cars and light trucks that most in the area use for transportation. Furthermore, bicycle riders do not contribute to the cost of construction.

Safe biking to work is worth investments. Sports biking should pay its way. Trails and paths should be built as communities expand connecting to existing networks.

The cost becomes so high for what we get.

The number of people biking or walking for business is extremely small and won't rise enough to justify the costs, especially in such a wet climate.

Trails ruin the surrounding homes and cause fires and invite crime.

Use of scarce resources to benefit the most people. Biking on major streets should be discouraged.

Most biking & walking trips are proven to be for recreation, not transportation. More bike & walking paths off streets is good; leave streets for cars & trucks.

The area I live in has invested in bike lanes that are rarely used and if used only on weekends for leisure biking. Bike lanes are a waste of resources.

We should NOT use taxes and fee from cars and trucks to pay for bike and ped. Also sidewalks should be paid for by the property owners. If you buy a home with sidewalks you paid for then as part of the cost of the home. So if you want sidewalks you should pay...... it is only fair.

Have the bicyclists pay their own way. Make them register just like drivers do.

Make it more convenient to those obey pedestrian and biking laws.

Until travel by auto, bus, is complete, bike should be secondary. I mean, get all the streets paved, sidewalked, and crossed safe, then we can get to alternative means of transport.

We have no money for this. Taxpayers and Businesses are over-taxed already. Have you really looked at how there is no real economic recovery to the middle-class?

Again, take into consideration the impact for the motorists who are trying to get from point A to point B etc. Quit taking valuable driving space and inserting bicycle lanes that are too close to vehicles. Not everyone wants to ride their bicycles to and from work or running errands. Quit shoving bicycle lanes down everyone's throats. Some of us choose to live where we do just to avoid the rude bicyclists, pedestrians who think they own the world.

Bicycles are fun but not a serious option for the majority of citizens.

Emphasis on walking not biking. Bicyclists think they own the roadways are a danger to themselves and others. Dedicated bike trails or roads are the exception.

See prior comments there is no cure for the stupidity of our officials.

Stop wasting money.

Stop using the gas taxes for bikes etc. Gas taxes should pay for roads only!
That relatively few people ride bikes.

Unless bike lanes are separated from motor vehicles and peds, they are incompatible. Unless your plan calls for this I think biking should be discouraged as transportation.

Continue current funding levels. Money should be directed to the greatest good for the greatest number ... and that's not walkers and bicyclists.

Keep money raised from motor fuel taxes from being siphoned off to support unrelated projects.

Sidewalks are built when areas develop, and bike paths need to be funded by those that use bike paths. ie. bicycle registration.

Walking is OK but biking is dangerous to pedestrians.

Bike lanes take away from car lanes. And many more people use cars than bikes.

I support better sidewalks within city limits. I support some bike paths in some rural areas, BUT NOT THOSE THAT BI-SECT PEOPLE'S PROPERTIES RIGHT NEXT TO THEIR HOUSES. Too much additional CRIME, VANDALISM, RAPE, INDECENT EXPOSURE, ETC. to burden homeowners with. CHECK POLICE STATISTICS & TALK TO POLICE DEPARTMENTS TO UNCOVER THE TRUTH.

No! because you want to reach way out into rural areas and "take" private property with no regards to property owner's rights. Might be ok if you improved the network within the cities - that's where you'll increase biking commuting anyway. You need to be smart about what you do and where you do it.

Sidewalks should be mandated for every developed lot, but bike paths/lanes should soley be paid for with a tax on bikes and bike tires.

What I see are many people using physical activity to get around, but doing it unsafely even when there are safety features right there. Maybe other areas have unsafe routes that need updating. I just usually see people either being un-informed about safety or being stupid.

Money would be better spend on other things.

Fix the potholes and roads first.

Again, no use of taxpayer dollars. Let's focus on improving roads and highways, which are the arteries of commerce.

Bikes are a particular problem. They pay nothing for roads but feel entitled and smug when they encounter cars. Very few people walk. the sidewalk system now in place is plenty.

Generally there are plenty of walking and biking routes currently for anyone interested in that activity. It is time to put more freeways and highways in.

They are doing just fine. I see know need for increasing this as a priority.

We have spent too much $$ on bikes already.

Weather in Oregon much of the year makes more biking and walking difficult especially to go to work. Wheelchair users also need bathroom which usually aren't built with transit systems.
Improve our streets and DO NOT reduce/eliminate travel lanes for bikes.

Less than 5% of the workforce chooses to walk or bike to work, yet we spend disproportionate amounts to accommodate the most fit, daring, or fool hardy members of our community. I hung my bike up years ago. Now I commute to work by single occupant vehicle, pay my taxes, and wonder who will ever use the bike paths we create?

We need to invest in the 205 beltway (west side bypass) and third bridge first.

We will always have cars/buses/trucks. Do not have bikes in their own lanes on arterials.

I would support better pedestrian crossings, but the bike lobby is too powerful in this region.

Just because there is a crosswalk, it does not mean that a person will use it instead of crossing in the middle of the street. More education is needed on this and more ticketing should be done in the main trouble spots. Also, there are studies shown that the blinking lights for a crosswalks actually make seeing the person in the crosswalk more vulnerable as the driver is focused on the blinking light and not if a person is crossing.

The lack of use of existing bike paths as evidenced by the volume of bicyclists on Division (bike route is 1 block away) and Powell. Sidewalks are great places to walk and there are plenty.

Until bikers are made to take a rules of the road exam at DMV like car drivers and are licensed and they all start obeying the law there will be no safe cyclist.

Walking yes, biking no.

Have you walked downtown Portland lately? Feeling safe isn't just connected to transportation. Portland has bigger problems not related to transportation. Stop spending road maintenance dollars on bike paths and trains.

I support more sidewalks and off-street bike paths. I do not support more bike lanes on vehicle roads, and it is a fallacy that our bike and walk options are “unsafe” - statistics do not show any increase as a percentage of the population in safety incidents.

I think public money could be used better than this.

Local jurisdictions are making strides in filling in the gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle networks, and with such limited resources at the regional level, this should not be the priority, especially given the equity considerations and the fact that this does not result in anything close to the same amount of VMT and carbon emission reductions as public transit investments.

This is not as important at the transit system.

We've invested a lot and bike use is declining. Bike doesn't really help an aging or suburban population.

While I usually support efforts to make us safer, I think there might be some bigger issues involving safety than worrying that the bikers are safe and have a convenient pathway. Most of the bikers on the Portland streets so not follow road laws so they are not being inconvenienced at all.
We already spend SO much money on bikes and it is mostly for the young and fit with time on their hands. Other people need transportation options also! The road in front of my apartment was recently changed to make a better bike path and it is much more difficult to get in and out of traffic and it is actually harder for me to see the bikes.

Bikers and others of their ilk are a nuisance to the roadways and go *crunch* under my tires, making me think I ran over something important.

Bikes can share the roads with cars. More bicycle paths would be "nice to have", but not "must have".

Cost, retrofit is very expensive.

I would generally support this as an ancillary budget item to building and maintaining roads.

Yet ANOTHER biased question. How about "Do you support a bunch of bikers that sometimes obey they law as if they were an automobile, but if they can benefit otherwise, than they ignore said laws? Would you like to make life better for them? I hate whoever wrote this poll.

Bikes should not be allowed to be both vehicles and pedestrians. No bikes on sidewalks or crosswalks. No vehicles waiting for bikes to cross where the street the bikes are on have a stop sign. Conflating the vehicle/pedestrian status simply makes drivers more confused and annoyed.

Seems plenty safe and convenient already.

Too much has already been spent.

We already have enough resources devoted to this. In fact too many over recent years.

We have spent enough on bikes in this city. We need to spend money on fixing the roads.

We've wasted enough money on bike lanes, biking at the expense of our infrastructure.

80+% of travel is by car - spend 80+% of the money on cars. Bikes pay ZERO road usage fees, so they should get ZERO money until they are willing to pay.

I feel that locations that are walkable are already serviced by sidewalks.

I rode a bike to work years ago on regular streets - never had a problem. Most people still drive cars, and if you look at commuting miles vs trips, bicycles are very insignificant. Too much money spent on bicycle "improvements" vs needs for the vast majority - car drivers.

I think we're doing pretty good. Realistically, we need to get people out of their cars and mostly that means transit.

Walking and biking work just fine without mega-dollars. I rode my bike to work for years in the 80's with no trouble; and I now walk a great deal. As long as a bike rider and a pedestrian uses common sense and does not act entitled, it already is safe. I now see some pedestrians acting like too many cyclists, arrogant and entitled, just jumping out in traffic w/o looking. Get back to responsibility and stop wasting huge amounts of dollars.
Bicyclists must start paying user and registration fees for the construction and maintenance of bike lanes and other specialized bicycle infrastructure.

How to do it in a sustainable manner that doesn't penalize those who are actually paying for it (ie, the owners of cars and land whose taxes to pay for the 'greenways' and such).

Sidewalks yes, bike lanes NO. Metro needs to get real and tax bicyclists and add fees to bicycling to pay for all the car lanes that are being taken away (creating more congestion that in turn adds emissions) and all the reserved space bicyclists now want on the roads.

Biking, walking are safe if people follow safety rules.

Enough! There are urgent needs in the region; more bike lanes aren't one of them.

In Portland why is it necessary to put bike decals on streets wherein a bike rider should know where to ride. Also very busy streets like freeways should be off limits to bike riders as they control all the local side streets.

Some moderate expense for maintaining bike lanes and paths and adding new lanes here and there is fine. Also addressing a dangerous connections. biggest issue is outside of the portland city limits in the suburbs.

Why did I answer "no"? Because the question is phrased in such a way that to answer no is to say "I don't want biking and walking to be safe and convenient." I do want it to be safe and convenient, but I want driving my car to be safe and convenient too. I also want it to be fast and efficient. I would support more lights, stop signs, and crosswalks for pedestrians in the name of safety, yes, and diverters on neighborhood greenways so that children can ride safely to and from school -- but major streets should remain car friendly.

You have done too much already.

It is good to improve sidewalk, but I can't see many people use it even if the streets are paved/improved.

Roads should accommodate vehicle movement.

Portland has lost sight of the % of bikes to other. There is also the fact that bike projects are enjoyed by people who do not pay a dime for this usage.

How many miles of street are repaired for CARS,TRUCKS< and COMMERCE.

Not until there is some registration, or tracking, of bicyclists that drivers, home owners and business owners can use for reckless or dangerous riders.

Only sidewalks where needed after paving the streets.

Some investment yes, but cars and mass transit will still be the major transit means.

Spending money on biking is a waste of money.

Too much money is spent on biking.

We already have green zones; bike lanes galore in NoPo.

We have an incredible bike system already and we have spent far too many millions already. It is time to stop removing vehicle lanes in favor of bike lanes. If the subject to stop the practice of removing vehicles lanes in deference to bike lanes ever was on a ballot, it would pass by a huge margin.
We have gone over board on this especially in Portland Proper. If we do more on this It should be out of Portland proper.

Yes we need safe biking and walking but we do not need to spend more than we already are spending.

Actually, I do support it, but only if done in a fiscally responsible manner. The recent work on Multnomah Blvd is a mess and a complete waste of money. There is no reason that the bike lane needs to be concrete rather than asphalt and there is no reason the bike lane and the sidewalk could not be on the inside of the planter. Excessive spending and poor design does not get my support.

Again, help people understand the consequences of investments in bikes vs. roads.

Bicycles don't work well on the mountainous west side, and they don't work well for older or disabled individuals. They may be fun for kids and young adults, but should be eliminated from a program that truly seeks to expand transit options for the total population.

Biking is a wonderful activity, but even in bike-obsessed Portland it will never provide transport for more than a small (but vocal) minority of residents.

Concentrate on transit! Stop spending huge amounts of money to pander to a very very small portion of the population - those who commute by bike. Endlessly punishing those who drive (like seniors who can't bike) is unfair.

Not until all streets are paved!

Only interested in sidewalk on Vermont. See last question.

We have already spent way too much on bike lanes and blvds.

Again forget the few bike riders.

Bicycling behavior should be confined to corridors(such as the transit corridors) rather than applied generally to all corridors. Doing this assures safety of the bicycling community as well as keeping that community in use of the transit system, thereby maintaining its economic viability.

I can understand why bicycles are not allowed on the sidewalks downtown but why not allow them on other sidewalks, it is probably less likely that a bicycle will have an accident with a pedestrian on a sidewalk than an auto or truck having an accident with a bicyclist on a road w/o a bike lane.

Cost.

I think biking and walking are very safe and convenient, and until disease stopped me, I commuted by bicycle for 8 years. The biggest threat to my use of a bicycle at that time was the busses.

Minimal impact on existing infrastructure is imperative. Costs must be minimized and borne across the entire community, not levied on specific neighborhoods or taxpayers.

Need to redirect the funds already in place, and have those go to the sidewalks. bikers can use the streets like they do everywhere else.
The low percentage of commuters who use biking and walking to get to work, the store, and school. ALSO, the varied typography of the region. What works in flat east Portland will not work in the West Hills.

Bicyclists over 18 should be required to have a license to operate a bicycle as many do not do this safely and expect cars to kowtow to them.

If the bicyclists want improvements, they should tax themselves. Not every single resident. You say "investment". I say waste of my hard earned money.

Mandates that include bicycle education and rules of the road or path. Just because you can pedal doesn't mean you understand how to mingle with others.

Only in areas where accidents historica1y occur.

Spend the least amount of money.

Stop wasting money on economically unsustainable projects.

Find a way to make those on bikes pay for it.

Here is my rant. "They" want it both ways. Bicyclists want motorists to treat them as a special category - both pedestrian and vehicle. But they do not obey the laws of the road or pedestrian laws. It is too dangerous.

I am for making walking easier and safer. not so with bicycles.

I would support directing current monies to this type of project, but by supporting "more investment" that usually means more taxes.

Before spending more on this, convince Portland to focus on paving the streets in has, filling potholes, etc. without any new street tax. It has no business trying to direct development before it can even maintain existing roads.

Cost per user mile based upon ACTUAL use of the path or route, including all infrastructure and support services to make it possible.

If you haven't noticed, it rains a lot here. Focus on enclosed methods of transportation, like electric cars, etc.

In Oregon rain, no more than 6% will ever commute by bike...it is a waste of precious resources.

Road diets are completely stupid and a waste...we need roads for cars that everyone uses.

Stop catering to the 2% who bike...such a waste.

Do so with the use of existing resources.

Educate people how to use existing biking and walking resources more effectively and with consideration of all users around them.
I checked No, but it really depends on what the plan is and where it is to be implemented. For example, it doesn't make a lot of sense to increase bike traffic in the steep areas of NW and SW Portland where few bike due to topography. It makes much more sense to dedicate ENTIRE STREETS to bicycle and pedestrian traffic rather than building bike lanes and sidewalks adjacent to vehicular traffic. Bike accidents and deaths are much higher than the national average in Portland because bikes and cars attempt to "share the road". Most of these accidents and deaths involve riders younger than 30. Check the hospital records! Money should be spent to speed up traffic, which 90% of us use every day, rather than spending money on more bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

No extension of current system of bike lanes in the street.

Seriously? Do you think people will suggest that Metro should pursue unsafe and inconvenient walking?

We have plenty of bike routes now. I wonder what percent of our transportation budget goes to a commuting method only 2-5% of Portlanders use. Sidewalks are very important, especially in sidewalk deficient places like East Portland, and should be invested in to increase safety.

Would say yes to this, but what has happened in Downtown Portland concerns me where they have these bike lanes and they cyclist do not use them - I have almost been hit by a bike more times than any automobile because the cyclist are not following the traffic lights - the walk sign turns to walk and I begin to cross and low and behold here comes a cyclist and they go right through the red light.

As in the previous statement I do bike to work whenever I can... but as a person that also drives to the store and to do average things.. The state hwys which include hwy 99, hwy 30 which most people know by their street names Powell blvd, MLK, 82nd ave and Lombard need major work done by the state and city... I have biked in this city before there were bike safety measures in place... ridding a bike on any of those street is legal but no prudent.

A bicycle is a non-mission-critical piece of transportation equipment that is unsafe in inclement weather, and not usable by young people, old people, and infirm/disabled people. Any investment aimed at forcing people to use it for mission-critical transportation is a waste of public money and I totally oppose it. It does not support economic development, local businesses. It doesn't reduce risk of traffic fatalities and injuries, particularly for the cyclist. It does not increase access to jobs and services except anecdotally (e.g., the cyclists who get interviewed for Oregonian articles). Don't you think that you could come up with a different potential benefits list than for question 1? You have now asked about bicycles in both questions 1 and 2. I wonder if I will see additional questions about bicycles as I complete this questionnaire.

Bikes make driving more difficult.

Do not implement it.
If I say make biking more convenient, more of them will be all over the roads. Bike paths make sense, but they are an expensive investment for few benefits. We have had bicycles since the end of the 19th century; if they were the answer to transportation needs, we would know it by now.

No, because it is a front for an anti-car agenda.

Not in the way I have seen this policy implemented. We don't need mile-wild bike lanes for the people who don't pay for the roadway. There is no reason they cannot already share the already oversized sidewalks to some extent or use a slightly wider shoulder. This is another feel-good program that must be paid by others for a few to benefit.

Private funding.

Spending money on biking in a city with steep hills is idiotic. I'd rather see Portland get the cyclists off steep, curving roads. A very small percentage of the population can bike to work, school, or shopping.

That is a "4%" "solution". Let's concentrate on the 96% who do not take long walks or bicycle.

The "investments" that have been made where I live have been stupid expensive and not effective.

The sidewalks and bike lanes provided are more than adequate. We do not need to invest any more money to study and design new ways to provide this service.

This is not my highest priority unless you're talking about biking for regular people and not the hip bikers. If we're talking transportation (biking as a means of), then that's great.

We've done that with no good results.

What a waste of money for very few people.

Consider the percentage of population actually using this mode of transportation. The majority of residents will never become year round walkers or bikers due to the weather and the need to be dressed appropriately for work. Not everyone can wear sweaty clothes all day nor do most places have showers for use.

Enough has been done on the east side. I don't see a lot of bike paths on the west side of town. Hmm... wonder why? Maybe the west side residents don't want all these improvements.

Making walking safer.

Portland has gone out of its way to reduce car traffic on streets and add bike lanes. I am against this approach.

The cost of extracting more tax dollars from the community, when those funds could go to hire additional employees, buy some capital equipment, expand a business. I think people would rather have a few more jobs available than a bike path.

Yes if voted upon.

I reside on Sauvie Island. Too many bikers are inconsiderate and foolish in their riding behavior.

Check most recent research. PDX demographics are &, more importantly, will, of necessity change. Fewer Portland is where the young go to retire, more 'older' folk.

In ADDITION to other modes, not instead of... don't hurt cars to help bikes... Again, always cheap in Portland.
I have seen a lot of investment in providing safe bike and pedestrian routes all over Portland. I see a lot of cyclists who put themselves in harms way when they don't obey the rules of the road. Portland needs to invest in safe roadways too because even as we try to reduce our carbon footprint we continue to have people who have to drive to get to their places of work. Trying to navigate unmaintained roadways makes an unsafe environment for everyone motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians.

There have been many 'investments' from other budget line items for this. Get rid of the things that waste space, in the middle of the streets.

Bike lanes and sidewalks are two different issues and putting them together make the results of this survey less valuable.

We are doing this already very well. We just need more sidewalks in East Portland for pedestrian safety.

Invest in roads and streets instead.

Walking yes--biking lower priority that frequent affordable mass transit because many more people will use mass transit than can bike...

Side walks do not make anything safer. We are retro fitting roads with stuff using up space for vehicles. Green ways, swales and side walks have taken up valuable space in the road way and we now have a livability problem due to the lack of room in the road. Cars are parked in the roadways and that creates a vision problem. Your making a mess.

The bicyclists are making it dangerous to drive any more on Portland streets. The city is more than accommodating creating bike paths but the cyclists don't use them or often just make their own rules, example, running red lights, not obeying the traffic signs, riding two or three abreast. It's ridiculous any more.

Again- no one is against safety. The issue is waste. It's 'nice" to have all manner of recreation, but cost for this recreation.. provided by taxpayer assessments.. is often an enormous investment.

Not unless we find a method for these groups to share in the expense.

Only after the city of Portland paves all its roads and puts in sidewalks! ---THEN the bike paths, but NOT BEFORE!

What we have is good for the bike traffic we have.

People were walking long before the invention of concrete and asphalt.

If bike & walk paths prove to be a frequently used as roads, comparatively, then I'd agree to put more $$ into them. Right now, you need to concentrate on the current transportation infrastructures.

Bikers should pay a share in improvements.
When I am on a bike or walking, I am the one who pays attention to others (cars, vehicles, etc). It is my responsibility. As the investment has occurred, people who use it, have not respected and kept this up. If the people who use are not able to abide by the laws of all who use the area, then the investment should be curtailed!

A qualified No. There is way TOO much emphasis on the damn bikers. How many bikers in comparison to people who drive or take public transportation? Adding more bike paths won't add more people who ride. There are those who do but the majority do not and will not. Just more money removed from road budget.

Attempts to make walking and biking more convenient has resulted in poor implementation, pedestrians disregarding common sense safety precautions, more congestion and confusion with drivers.

Cost.

I support sidewalks on public right-of-ways but no pathways on private properties.

Invest in our roads they are in deplorable condition.

It is not the job of city government to push a bike agenda. Sidewalks used to be a priority until the bike agenda took over. Now cars and pedestrians are in danger from the bikers.

Safely and convenience of walkers.

So many of our communities already have sidewalks and bike paths. It is time to spend our tax payer money on improving our economy.

The area has spent far too much money on bike lanes.

There is no royalty as it applies to transport mode. Until bicyclists are charged user and/or license fees to pay for bicycle infrastructure, it should not be funded. Revenue should not be poached and siphoned off from motorist paid taxes for freeloading bicyclists.

We are spending way too much in these areas and as a result letting our highways and streets decay. We need to make big investments in our highway system to move more traffic faster.

We have already made o much of an investment in these areas.

Automobiles.

Cost.

I put "No" only because the option to say "Yes but not at the expense of making driving and commuting by automobile" was not available. Again, walking and biking are perfectly legitimate forms of transportation but for the vast, vast majority of folks, they simply don't work or pencil out.

I support sidewalks on public right-of-ways but no pathways on private properties.
In Finland bike lanes are not in the street but clearly painted on the sidewalk. Bikes do not interfere with vehicular traffic and pedestrians have their own safety lane on the sidewalk. Most importantly, there are no bikes passing cars on the road on the right. All bikes are registered and bike riders pay a license fee to offset the cost of maintaining and creating bike lanes on sidewalks. Our current system is dangerous to cyclists and a nightmare for drivers. At some point all the bike riders will no longer be able to ride their bikes and cars will once again become a necessity for them. I do not support extension of bike lanes in their current form.

Invest in our roads they are in deplorable condition.

Not at the expense of autos and mass transit. There need to be more arterial streets that are designated for automobiles and other motor vehicles. The recent designation of a major arterial, namely SE 52nd, has no nearby convenient road for cars to travel. What’s the sense of that. Traveling SE 60th is difficult. The road has dozens of potholes, is narrow, has on-street parking (on the west side of the street). Cross town traffic in Portland is a farce. The bike lanes on SE 26th, the high school (Cleveland) where kids AND teachers jaywalk, the no turn on red signs at Powell Blvd. Please tell me which cross-town (north-south) arterials are available for cars. Walking? That’s a joke. Bikes kill pedestrians as well as cars. I’m more afraid of bike riders than I am of cars because people on bikes seem to think they have the right of way in all situations.

Sherwood is currently implementing walking areas to the detriment of the community. Reality is, the areas they are setting up for people to walk to will not happen.

What the people want!! Whenever you put in a sidewalk, maintenance immediately shifts to the abutting property owner which is a burden on individuals rather than the general public who benefit. Metro should not undertake any projects unless 3 conditions are met: 1. No loss of automobile lanes and traffic flow 2. No loss of parking 3. Maintenance and operations of all transportation facilities is factored into the costs. Metro should not be pushing local jurisdictions to install these expensive and questionable "fixes" that serve only a tiny proportion of the population at the expense of the vast majority who need and want to use automobiles to get around.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97035</td>
<td>Rain and needing a change of clothing. Dark days - hard to see bikers many roads too narrow for a bike path. ie: Scholls Ferry Rd. Hills are also a defeating factor. Need secure placea to store bike when at destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97124</td>
<td>Supportive in principle, but I would place this lower on the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97211</td>
<td>All of the community. We also need to remember our county is not very employer friendly so many jobs need to be driven to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97214</td>
<td>Should be careful to minimizing conflicts between options (including bike/transit; bike/walk ). Metro/City should be more thoughtful about how to ensure one mode (like bikes) don’t get priority over other modes that offer broader mobility options and/or offer more mobility for general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97217</td>
<td>Biking and walking safe are not the same issue. Many cyclists are disrespectful of pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unable to cycle, motorways & parking are a greater priority!

Not biking. There is already too many bikers and there is too much traffic in portland to make biking safe for commuters. There are also no through streets in NE Portland, except for the busy roads with lots of car traffic. for walking in my neighborhood -- what's the point? There is nothing to walk to.

Simply paving streets in some areas will help neighborhoods and make it safer for bikes and walkers.

Equity. Stop listening to the developers. Stop listening to the small but vocal bike lobby and start listening to Outer SE- esp. the Latino & Asian communities.

SURVEY IS IDIOTIC.
3. Do you support more investment by your community and our region to make streets and highways safe, reliable and connected?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>Who wouldn't like that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7236</td>
<td>Do a study on how many accidents deaths etc. have happened in areas where there is little transportation and sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9702</td>
<td>See my previous comment about Connect 3 money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9722</td>
<td>Change funding sources that keep roads in good repair. Change gas tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9730</td>
<td>Making this happen as fast as possible. This is how most people and businesses get around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97002</td>
<td>The neglect of highways and roads in favor of expensive inefficient projects with a low ROI such as light rail and trams is irresponsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Do not bargain out repairs to the lowest bidder, you get what you pay for. There are roadways being repaved in Beaverton/Aloha now that are substandard just to look at, makes you wonder if there was any engineering thought put into the planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Reconfiguring traffic lanes to accommodate increased volume, and allowing for safe bike commuting, too. Ample road shoulder length. For example, S.W. 170th Ave. between S.W. Baseline and S.W. T.V. Hwy. Where are the sidewalks on a vast stretch of this road??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surface, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Widening roads that are used heavily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Beaverton (and probably other suburbs of Portland) desperately need better connections. Beaverton may have a bike lane or route on each side of downtown but there is NO safe connection through. Crossing canyon road &amp; Beaverton-Hillsdale while on Hall or Watson is extremely intimidating (especially with a kid in a bike trailer). What good do the bikeways do if they are NOT connected thru the most vital part of town?? I live in Cedar Hills, just a couple miles from the library/farmers market; I would love to feel that biking there is a viable option for my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Build the Westside bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Developers must pay for adequate roads. Drivers must pay for road improvements. Many businesses will have to move (back).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Fill the potholes first, then deal with re making the whole road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Impacts on natural habitats/ecosystems should be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintain existing roadways first, use technology to improve flow, use technology to improve public transit use/efficiency. Only then consider widening, new roads. That approach should only be considered where significant new development is allowed that relies on old, poorly designed roads of yesteryear.

Potential impacts to transit operations (transit comes first).

Road repair, improving timing of stop lights. I do not support widening roads.

Roundabouts.

Studded tires in the Willamette Valley are unsafe most of the time if a driver installs new studs November 1 then drives studs FIVE-months on mostly dry or wet pavement. UNSAFE? On Nov. 1 weather is mild. Metal spikes on tires CAN NOT GRIP rough pavement. Moving car dances on metal spikes. Pavement is immediately carved. Sometimes weather is a couple days of snow in late Nov. through February. Studios that have carved pavement for a month are nubs by December. So, if snow traction is necessary, stud-quality traction is impossible. In January studs have disappeared to nipples and holes (where a stud has ejected at Freeway speed). In March roads are rutted and studs are gone. So, studs are mostly worthless for snow traction and rutted roads are not safe for any driver. We won't ban studs. So uneducated drivers buy studs as legal winter traction devices and use them FIVE-MONTHS unsafely. To have high quality traction and preserve pavement, require that studs be mounted on separate wheels. Now driver can, on 50 degree temperature November 1, put set of studs in trunk of car and drive home on rubber tread wheels. Put studs on extra wheels in closet. Listen to weather forecast. If snow predicted, take studs out of closet and check air pressure. Change over to studs for the days of snow then put rubber tread.

This should be considered through the lens of encouraging alternative means of transportation (i.e. cycling, walking, public transit). There are drastic improvements to be made in the design of our infrastructure that can empower non-driving users and therefore negate or reduce the need to add more capacity.

While I would prefer to see roads get smaller, and for people to drive cars with only one person less often, I do think that roads (and bridges) need to be updated and improved.

All the gravel and trash from the road ends up in the bike lane. Please either clean out the bike lanes more often or create a way so that road trash does not end up in the bike lane. A small barrier would help and also serve the purpose of making the bike lanes safer.

All these things cost and cannot be done all at once. Making decisions about what is the most cost effective will require making difficult decisions and needs really good leadership.

Contiguous bike lanes—there are so many places where bike lanes suddenly disappear!

Existing road maintenance funding sources (possible new vehicle tax in Washington County, etc.).

Finding ways to expedite traffic flow thus reducing commute times & total fuel use & emissions.

Gas tax. Those of us that drive should be paying for the improvements.

I'm tired of local politicians spending money on MAX and pet projects. Safe, sufficiently wide roads are priority 1. More lanes if needed to alleviate traffic. Buses are best form of mass transit and they need roads.
Improved signage. For example, many signs have become dirty or hidden by foliage. Some are not clear because of changed traffic patterns or increases in traffic. Many bridge entrances have convoluted and confusing approaches. In areas with multiple forms of active transportation, it is hard to become aware of all the hazards.

Not only better roads, but our bridges are chokepoints that need investment. Of course, safety and reliability are important, but I hesitate to endorse the idea of more connected streets and highways. Let’s be wary of paving over paradise, please.

Parts of Portland and Washington County look like third-world byways. This is unacceptable.

Paying for it. I support a serious raise to gasoline taxes—at least $1 per gallon to start. Some folks will switch to public transit, some will drive a little less. Others will pay for their driving pleasure and there will be a little more $ for road repairs. I do not support new major roads because I believe that if we build them, they will instantly fill with traffic.

Pot holes everywhere, while ODOT elects to spend $250K a pop on useless, hazardous signs telling us what we know already—how long it will take us to get to major hwy intersections. This patronizing attitude needs to stop. I understand about "Amber Alerts" but let’s look rationally at pros and cons. Those making these decisions should be fired.

Proper timing for pedestrian crossing lights. Good signage.

Reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely. Plus to insure that current trees and/or environment is protected from overly aggressive contractors that just want to cut everything down.

Roadways, especially those on the west side of the Portland Metro area, have been inadequate, poorly planned, dead-ended, and otherwise made impractical & chronic sources of time/money/energy waste for over two decades. By permitting Washingtonians to chronically congest our roadways without paying the mega sums they owe us for upkeep, additions, maintenance, and expansions, Oregonians are forced into wasting our personal resources, at their benefit. The major roads are congested at all times of the day and night costing employers and workers vast sums, including health costs from severe transportation-related stress. In my former job, I traveled 600 miles/week and spent more than half my time sitting fruitlessly trapped on roads throughout the tri-county area. It’s important to recall that it’s not JUST freight that needs to move around this Metro area. There are thousands of building construction/repair/maintenance workers, restaurant delivery workers, utility employees, home health professionals, taxi drivers, lawn/yardcare workers, social welfare workers, lab couriers, home/office decorators, real estate agents, and countless others who don’t work behind a desk (most of the time), but are out driving around (usually in their own vehicle) from one residence or business to another, bringing their

The infrastructure of the entire nation needs work.

Unfortunately congestion gets worse when multi-dwelling units are built where one house used to be, and there's only one access road.
We already have enough roads. If you widen them, then do so to add sidewalks and bicycle paths. Do not widen them to allow more cars go through. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income to subsidize adding sidewalks and bicycle lanes. Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Where will the $$ come from? I do not support building new roads if we cannot manage the upkeep on the one we have. I do support minor changes that would make alternate routes work better esp with education or promotion to make the alternates known.

A lot of progress has been made in the area west of Beaverton and south of TV Hwy in the last 3 decades: widening of Murray, Farmington, and 185th, for starters, and improvements on 170th and 160th. However, 185th still suddenly narrows here and there, which slows the commute; 170th gets very backed-up in the morning commute.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

Eases congestion, reduces crime, encourages community interaction.

Emphasis should be on improving safety.

Expand I-205 to the west side of Portland with new bridge across Columbia River west of I-5. This will be needed as most of the regional growth is projected to occur in Washington County, I read recently. Do not replace current I-5 Interstate bridge.

Fix highway 217 congestion.

Focus on smaller improvements like completing roads that carry between one and two lanes. That should refuse congestion, and fuel use.

Good repair, yes. Addition of traffic control (stop signs, lights) in problem areas, yes. TIMING THE TRAFFIC LIGHTS PROPERLY like every other city on earth, yes (I shouldn't be driving down the street doing the speed limit at 8 pm and hit EVERY SINGLE RED LIGHT on a 2-mile stretch - that's a waste of my time and gas and terrible for the environment as my car is just sitting there for no reason spewing out extra pollutants). Widening, on the other hand, often makes streets LESS safe for bicycles and pedestrians as it increases traffic flow and at the same time makes drivers feel more safe because they have more road, so they don't pay as much attention (there is science on this; look it up). More pavement is also worse for the environment in terms of run-off. Street widening should be undertaken with great care and as a last resort.

How to provide for the greatest number of end users at the best cost.

I wish I were more educated on how to do this.

If the streets are too crowded and unreliable drivers get frustrated and make bad driving decisions, endangering the rest of us.

It is late but we should create as convenient roads as possible.
Maintain existing infrastructure and implement desired improvements by encouraging infill/increased housing density near public transit, parks and recreational areas. Realistically assess how zoning changes, UGB expansions and new development impacts existing roads, local neighborhoods and overall quality of life.

Make it easier for commuters to go around high elevation areas (like Cooper Mountain) than right over the top. In winter the top of Cooper Mountain SW of Beaverton is icy and snowy and is treacherous. Car trips are expected to triple there by 2035. Spend less funds to improve the routes over the top and more on arterials around it, please.

More traffic enforcement. and Im not talking about Beaverton style radar vans.

Personal property values should never be reduced by road improvements if they may then owner shall be compensated at the proper rate.

Reducing traffic congestion with increased driving lanes.

The City of Portland wanted to add yet another tax to fund this effort. Further, Washington County has an issue on the ballot to fund "road and bridge" maintenance. If these bodies were serious, they would have already budgeted for this effort. No wonder government is so poorly respected.

This policy is essential for our society.

We have significantly under invested in our surface system. We have no reliable North/South connectivity on the West side and our current corridors all need additional lanes.

Where people are going, especially commutes, as to which roads need repair, upgrade, etc.

Create alternate routes to dilute traffic (note: more Columbia River Crossings instead of one new giant one as one specific example) and enhance disaster recoveries. Avoid building new or bigger roads if there are other, effective, creative options. Clearer road markings in some areas. Faster and more effective clearing of accidents on major routes--and an aggressive targeting of tail-gating as a major cause of accidents or aggravation of existing ones, leading to congestion. Complementary policies to reduce commuting distances.

Focus on Portland outer eastside, east of I205. Also focus on areas around schools...make sure kids have safe walking routes to schools.

How this will make it easier for people to get from Point A to Point B.

I support this, but in actuality as pointed out most of the investment is actually going to improve Active transportation instead of improving the roadway network. Also, Portland has an agenda to reduce lane miles and convert them to bike. Thus making travel congested and a misguided attempt to make transit an attractive alternative.

It would be great to have more roads out of the Scholls area to the freeways.

Most of us will continue to travel by auto. The better the roads, the safer and easier the commute.

No more widening of highways, arterials.
Pave our streets without a tax. I know the liberals on the city council call it a street fee but cut the budget somewhere else and quit screwing the tax payers.

We need to be careful—we won’t be able to build our way out of congestion, and it’s easy for this type of spending to consume all of the available resources.

The “yes” with which I answer is a qualified “yes.” While we do have streets and highways that need widening for safety reasons, I would hate to see our area become another LA or NYC. We are approaching that in some areas already, at least visually. Streets inherently support the use of cars and trucks. I use both a car and a truck, but would rather we spend our resources on efficient mass transit to move people. I have adopted the concept that I can get many things delivered to my doorstep for less than it would cost me to go to a store. The UPS, USPS, FedEx, etc. trucks are already on the roads and ultimately pollute less than I would by making a separate trip. Can we get more people to understand, perhaps through advertising the concept, that monetary and ecological costs go down when we use such services?

Maintaining existing infrastructure is a higher priority than creating new highways and byways. That being said, this region will die economically if we do not have a third Columbia River bridge in the greater Portland area.

Many rural areas don’t want increased connectivity in their footprints, but these changes seem appropriate for urban areas.

Moving freight, nursery stock, manufactured goods, etc. DOES benefit my local community.

People are not going to abandon car transportation. We must keep road system safe.

This needs to be done within the budget and not by setting new fees and or taxes to pay.

We should start spending money on roads and highways, WAY less on mass transit.

Don’t leave out rural areas.

Environment and safety.

Expand our bridges.

Increase vehicle registration fees to cover increased costs.

More Freewys.

More gas taxes and plat taxes.

Better timing of traffic lights to ease flow and congestion (I-205 and Johnson Creek is bad.) also, do small repairs quickly before they get worse and costs increase substantially.

Keeping bushes, brush and trees cleared from the visual paths of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians so there are no barriers.

There are many places you simply can’t reasonably travel to without a car. Sellwood in particular is badly in need of widening.

Well lighted, better street repair, connecting routes.
Consider making the turn lanes have a blinking yellow light so they may turn when oncoming traffic is slow or non-existent. This will speed up the movement of cars and buses. Buses are much more user friendly than light rail. They are also much more flexible; light rail goes from point A to B and cannot deviate. Buses can be switched at most any time if they are need in a different area.

This is, in my opinion, the most important thing we can accomplish. The positive impacts of congestion reduction through roadway capacity has been badly underestimated as a solution.

Unsure.

Not tear up new projects like they are doing on Hwy 99E in front of OC Shopping Center. What a waste of government money.

Consider the impact on local businesses many businesses operate on the cusp of closing, even a marginal inconvenience could mean the difference between staying in service and closing doors.

Cost. Are present fuel taxes being collected and applied to the improvement of streets and highways? Perhaps an independent audit is needed.

Designate high volume/low volume surface streets--low volume for walking, biking. Label as such like one way streets.

Maintain what we have, make more room for bikes, fix pot holes.

Not sure. Where is the money and taxes being spent now and howabout a public audit report.

Repair and possible widening of east county roads (division and Powell from Willamette to 39th especially).

Charge user fees to give drivers appropriate price signals (charge for every mile on every road, by time of day). To really benefit the climate, switch to electric cars powered by renewable energy.

Consider if any of the roadway usage could be reduced by providing alternatives to driving. Focus spending on encouraging people to use other options vs. continuing to add roads and widen streets. Enforce rules for when snow tires are allowed. Consider a per mile charge for snow tires.

Higher speed limits on the freeways like all of the other states. It's crazy how slow people drive on our highways. And put in more lanes.

Keep roads repaired, don't build new roads, widen as needed.


Moving forward and doing something rather than continuing to do nothing. Also thou roughly investigate all people and companies involved when planning and doing work. The massive waste I hear about daily on road and bridge work is staggering and wrong!

Politicians always like photo opps at openings of new things but the politicians need to do photo opps at the start of major repair/maintece projects also we need more tunnels. I5 should go below ground at milepost 296 & surface at milepost 4 on the Washington side.
Prioritizing primary roads before secondary and minor streets & roads. Coordination of the state highways with the county roads and city streets so road tear ups and other activities are linked.

Reasonable speed limits, realistic traffic needs.

State wide roads/streets are in bad condition. Budget cuts have had a big negative impact.

Street maintenance has to take priority over new infrastructure, even pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and definitely before transit.

The best engineering possible. Efficient implementation that prioritized current transportation heavy use times.

The reality is most commuters are still in cars and autos and use them more than mass transit at this point. They are becoming more efficient and green as we see with the electric and hybrid vehicles. Quit fighting it and build the roads to accommodate them; widen the roads and upgrade efficiency.

They should not promote more travel.

This is how the great majority of our people get around.

This is the most rational and desirable of all the alternatives proposed. It should be given top priority. The region's factotums have ignored streets and highways for 30 years. As a result they are in poor repair and will require billions to restore just to their former condition much less improving them.

This is where the region should have spent the money wasted on light rail for nearly 40 years now. Virtually every arterial is crowded, dirty and ugly. That's because adequate money has not been spent on maintaining streets and on increasing their capacity in favor of light rail. We will pay the price of this misappropriation of resources forever.

Yes, and this includes making the necessary capacity improvements so rural/farm roads outside UGB are safe to travel on for all modes.

Bridges and infrastructures need to be able to withstand weather and earthquakes.

Build two the freeways to reduce congestion on I-5 and 217.

Immediate repairs and expansion of some of the freeways.

Medium priority, looking to phase out.

Programs/infrastructure should be sustainable in the sense that we can continue building upon them easily.

Stop saying that each new tax and fee will go to roads and then have it diverted to something that some politician thinks is "related" to road usage.

Street connections should ensure use only by neighborhood traffic and not cut through traffic from collectors or arterials, especially in suburbia where streets are used as outdoor play spaces for children.

Tackle the bottlenecks 1st.

That is how most get around. Keep traffic moving efficiently.
This is another area where high traffic shopping districts need to be considered. Keep the shoppers out of the way of workers driving home (widen 217 @ Washington Square, tualatin- Sherwood hwy @ Cabelas).

Keeping the existing infrastructure in good repair should be a top priority. Upgrades can happen for urgently needed problems next.

To a point this is a good policy, but encouraging alternate means of transportation should be a strong balance to any highway projects.

Maintenance anticipated growth.

Always keep in mind pedestrian and bike options.

As answered in question 1. Having housing, light industry, and retail in close proximity to affordable housing.

Congestion costs money for everyone and adds pollution. Eliminating congestion is the best way to gain efficiency for the means of transport used by most people.

Cost.

Declining/stabilizing highway usage overall, especially for non-freight usage.

Don't raise taxes.

Either stop all of this insane growth or build more highways & freeways to interconnect the urban and suburbs areas.

Eliminating congestion bottlenecks, that result in reduced economic expansion and/or making our area less competitive, has to be number one priority.

Far to often the will of the people has not been listened to as precious resources that should have been directed toward an improved highway system have been used to build a light rail system that is being under utilized. I believe our citizens are saying "No more light rail."

I strongly support "targeted" improvements.

Improving the infrastructure of the roadways.

It cost far less to repair things now than to let maintenance lag and then re-build roadways. Sacrifice expansion to maintenance.

Keep roads safe for bicycling.

keeping what we currently have in good repair should be #1, then we could think about upgrading or replacing outdated streets/highways. Building new highways should be last thing we do.

Long term cost.
New developments should be required to have less tunnel visioned traffic studies - how do we get these drivers to the main highway in the best way, not just oh let's use this crappy old rural road and hope they use the main road instead but we won't try to discourage them from using this little rural road and no we won't pay for upkeep for the little rural road. There needs to be better ways for drivers to get to the main roads - NEW WAYS not just doing the minimal traffic study for the immediate area but make new routes to get these folks where they want to go in an efficient manner. They can still take the rural roads of course, but not at 100 mph trying to beat the new route. New developments need new routes to get to the big roads and highways. Better routes. Homeowners on the rural streets shouldn't have to pay with their quality of life because a developer and the city didn’t take the time to design things right.

Pedestrian walkways over busy roads (ie. where Beavercreek and 213 meet).

Perhaps burn the candle from both ends? Focus primarily on main urban routes but also make sure to dedicate a percentage to improving rural regional roadways that are already being used by some to bypass clogged throughfares. Adding lanes should be done sparingly and where it will obviously help - as opposed to just shifting congestion to another place.

Prioritize a sustainable system of funding to do the work. Included in this is an analysis of why it is so darn expensive for governments to undertake these projects anymore. What are the costs of all the environmental regulations/reports, prevailing wage requirements, etc? The web of hidden costs makes doing this in a cost-effective manner challenging.

Reduce congestion.

Roads that are smooth and good pothole repair.

Stop diverting funds to mass transit.

The population keeps growing and we are a suburb type city with another state involved. You could not take a bus or bike to Vancouver from where I live and that is the kind of planning I think I hear. As in light rail to Tualatin??? But we do not plan for cars. As in having to make Foster into two lanes. I agree it has to be safe for cars and bikes. But we also need to build roads as they did in the old days. This is not the East coast.

There needs to be less landscaping. At intersections the landscaping gets in the way of vision. Oregon has plenty of trees and bushes with out putting it right in the way of vision at intersections and medians.

This is number one mode of transportation in and out of city (as well as around the city) and should be weighted accordingly!

This increases jobs.

This is helpful for those of us on the edges of the UGB.

This is not NYC. We drive cars out here. It's too far to everything to try to ride a Max train. or ride a bike to go to a concert.
This should be the priority when allocating funds for transportation. Our state is large and the distances people travel for work and recreation are greater than those of Europe and the East Coast, so highway infrastructure is very important. Our way of life has developed in response to the geography of the area. Public transportation, while necessary, is slow, cumbersome and inflexible, and most of us choose personal automobiles because of their convenience, and because most of us do not wish to spend 2 hours or more per day commuting. It is not government's role to determine what type of transportation we should use and to legislate "nudges" to force us to comply.

Who pays and will it benefit those that do.

More lanes for freeways.

Widen Cornelius pass

Focus on areas in the Metro region that have historically been neglected.

Increase gas tax to adequately maintain our road system.

Keeping the road system in excellent repair should be the norm, good means average.

LET'S FACE IT, CARS ARE NOT GOING AWAY UNLESS YOU PEOPLE OUTLAW THEM. THE FASTER WE GET TO WHERE WE ARE GOING, THE LESS FUEL WE BURN.

Raise the gas tax to get adequate funding.

For those of us who do not live near transit, please repair the roads.

Roads are the life line of any community. Being safe, well taken care of and accessible to all directions keeps the flow of life happy and moving.

Considering new development - developers pay for these projects - quit passing on these cost to everyone else. when a road is scheduled for maintenance, this should be considered.

Dependent on locations.

Electric cars, hybrids, fuel-cell powered cars, or plane, old, gas-guzzlers, we all need decent roads. So does most transit! Fill the holes, fix the worst (and second- and third-worst) traffic hazards (see "buses as hazards", above). That's what I want you to do with MY tax dollars...gas taxes, city/county/state general fund road taxes, etc. I DO support light rail to the degree that it can be demonstrated to help people leave their cars at home, but I have seen nothing to tell me that much money spent on bike transit has any, significant, impact of anything but recreational bike riding.

Focus on this as this is still the main travel option for our economy. Keep this infrastructure in excellent condition because it is that important.

I notice a big difference in my gas consumption on a well-paved smooth road compared to a rough road with grooves and deterioration. Getting road repair money from gas taxes seems like a disincentive. Probably should look at options for funding road repair.

Keeping traffic flowing.
Spend the taxes collected on streets, not unproven eco feel good projects ie: charging stations for elec. cars. Let the buyers of those cars pay.

The money is used wisely and actually for the roads.

The total commute remains predominantly automobile. Even with all the changes in transit and alternate systems, the vehicle is the backbone that should be accommodated. The greatest investment should be in relieving congestion on highway systems.

This is a poorly worded question with an obviously directed response. Temper safety with effectiveness: performing drastic changes in the name of safety is a smokescreen to achieving other goals, such as increasing reliance on public transportation or forcing my family to go grocery shopping on our bikes in the rain. Bad question--the drafter should have given a meaningful choice--of course reliability and effectiveness of the transportation system is desired, but gearing this to justify Metro's agenda is transparent and for the gullible.

Traffic studies, existing quality of roads.

Which highways and byways are traveled the most.

Build more roads and get bicycles off the road.

Everybody uses the roads, and they are way too congested. On the West side, start by widening 99W to at least 6 lanes (7 would be better).

First, keep the roads in good repair. It feels like the infrastructure is falling apart when we have to drive on roads that are filled with potholes and crumbling cracks. Next, use sensible and sane signaling, where I am not stopped at every light because they are not timed. And figure out how to leave lines for bike lanes even when the road narrows. In Tualatin, the lanes just disappear when it's inconvenient to provide the stripes. Of course, Tualatin is terrible for traffic anyway. Not just because of the new Nyberg Rivers development. For instance, Boone's Ferry is a terrible choke point heading north into the downtown area. Ridiculous.

Hopefully de-emphasize autos. Don't always widen the road see if folks are close enough to walk for their quick trips to the store and so forth.

Increase number of lanes to handle more traffic.

It is impossible not to say "yes" to this question- how could one support unsafe highways? But I would rather invest more in bike trails.

Maintaining what we already have is much less expensive than letting streets fall into disrepair. The City of Tualatin has an excellent plan to do just that which should be considered for other cities.
My city has a policy requiring connected streets and all but prohibiting new cul-de-sacs except where slope warrants; but, political pressure by NIMBYs has prevented a few street extensions and connecting intersections long planned on the books. I think Metro needs to step in more if it can learn of these incidents. Also, I firmly believe the region needs more connections where they are lacking, even if that involves eminent domain. In general, I’m against new fat arterial roads and widening existing streets. I’d like to see maximum block sizes in the region, and especially in the ‘burbs, I want more streets extended and block sizes shrunk through shorter skinny streets, and I want “complete streets.” Third, I want to defeat the trucking lobby and allow cities to enforce truck routes. Having truck routes means other streets and roads can be skinnier and have narrower curb radii at intersections -- less speeding!

Portland tried to establish a street fee. Although I don't' live in pdx the fee is much lower than car repairs and new tires. 

Smart growth, not just extra lanes. Timed lights to enhance travel through our towns and minimize stop-and-go traffic.

Sometimes we don't need 12 foot sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and all the urban planning.

We must have a way to keep our streets and highways maintained and in good working condition .... this should be built into any and all systems when developed!

We need more connected highways. We need a western bypass to get the trucks off of Tualatin Sherwood Rd. We need wider roads to accommodate vehicles in the future.

We should consider why we are diverting roadway funds for million dollar ‘active transportation ‘trails.

We should definitely keep what we have in good repair before building new. Any new HCT options cannot come at the cost of existing traffic lanes.

Add sidewalks, crossing cross walks with traffic control lights. Reduce speed limits - AND ENFORCE SPEED LIMITS. Enforce DUII laws. Don't just slap the DUII offenders on the wrists and put them back on the street.

Car and truck infrastructure should be the highest priority.

Cost versus benefit.

Despite what Portland experienced trying to tax to fund road repairs, sometimes leaders need to make the unpopular decisions--that's why they were elected. We need reliable roads or we all suffer-businesses and employees!! How do these protesting people think roads get repaired and maintained? Are they aware the last time the state gas tax was raised. You need to educate, educate, educate.

Focus on maintaining existing roads and highways. De-prioritize road widening and new freeway construction.

Highways/streets most traveled and those that are major in separate communities should be given priority.
However, before new taxes are implemented we need to make sure the dollars that are collected for this purpose are actually being used for this purpose. I believe lots of street/highway dollars are being spent on bike lanes, curb cuts, and mass transit.

I'm not so sure connected needs to be focused on as I feel our major roads are connected as well as they can be given our geography. We do need to continue to make them safer and easier to get on and off - like where I-5 S & 217 merge and meld together at Bridgeport. It is somewhat safer now that there is a longer distance to merge, as long as people realize they have plenty of time.

Increase gas tax.

Investigate the amount of commerce that is created when citizens have access to quality roadways and traffic flows smoothly. The amount of transit time to and from a work site is significantly reduced in a majority of cases when workers than drive a motor vehicle.

Long-term vision vs. short-term reactions to current problems.

Maintenance and less traffic.

Once again, it is the car that most in the area use. This should be the primary area of focus.

Outlaw studded tires.

Portland has high commute times for a city of its relative size. Even San Diego has shorter commute times because of good transportation infrastructure. Need to offset lost gas taxes for cars that are hybrids or electric.

Provide connectors between homes and jobs. Provide for safe truck movement.

Start spending transportation dollars on roads NOT passenger rail. Decentralized transportation systems are a lot less money.

The infrastructure needs to be improved for better connections to communities.

This is basic.

"Build it and they will come" is a negative aspect of building more efficient system. In Wilsonville we back up because the freeway south backs up...but we just put in a more efficient system and more people come to the area. Good for business...not so good on traffic patterns that got worse over time.

"Investment" doesn't necessarily mean more money for more roads. First, update and maintain the roads we have! Widen/resurface as needed, more/easier-to-read signage, erosion control in mudslide areas, vegetation control in low-visibility areas.

But to a lesser degree than mass transit and bike lanes. we need to create efficient affordable and safe option beyond car driving.

Create swales to absorb run-off water.

Easier acces to highways.
Generally, except for Multnomah County/Portland there is a great need for more arterial links throughout the region. The lack of arterials in Clackamas and Washington County results in much higher than appropriate use of the interstate freeways for commuter trips. If more arterial circulation was available freeway capacities for through travel (inter city and interstate) would be enhanced, without adding more lanes.

I would support significant investment in the widening and expanding of the road systems.

Install reflector plates within the center stripes on Bell Road south of Graham’s Ferry Road, arguably the most dangerous roadway in the tri-county area.

Less streets passing through neighborhood centers so that those areas are pedestrian friendly and safe. How about one way loops around the perimeters of our neighborhood centers and NO streets through the center of them.

Put an interchange at the Boeckman Road overpass.

Spend our money on building more roads and expanding the current roads. Our road system has not kept up with the population growth and the reality is that people use CARS for travel.

Too many transportation dollars have been fluttered away on light rail, serving less than 3% of trips, while our freeways and arterial roads are a mess. Improve transportation with more lanes on freeways, and more expressways to connect transportation centers.

Use the money from the gasoline tax only for road construction and maintenance.

We need to build more roads.

Build new roads to support to-and-from-work needs.

I'd like to see more complete upgrades. e.g. access TO Cooper Mountain has been improved but not roads ON Cooper Mountain (SW 209th & Grabhorn at Farmington Rd and SW 175th & Roy Rogers at Schools Ferry.) These roads are used as an alternate to Murray but the traffic on the mountains is ridiculous.

Plan for 50 years of growth, not for immediate needs.

Prioritize streets that do not have sidewalks.

Repair.

Washington County needs a new north/south freeway. Like I-205.

Again, timing of traffic lights to enhance flow of traffic toward city center in the AM, and away from in the PM commute times. Additional lanes along Powell, fewer bus stops. Why must there be a bus stop every 100 yards? Ridiculous.

ALL Metro-area roads should be paved. That should be the #1 priority. THEN begin repair and maintenance. Finally, I am tired of seeing roads torn up for repair and then every time (I am not exaggerating!) the road is torn up again for a water or sewer repair or for putting in different corners or crosswalks. There must be some system in place to make the work less repetitious and costly.
Better east-west traffic FLOW east of 205. Morning and evening commuters should NOT have to stop at every stop light heading east and west. Time the lights, and make pullouts for the busses. Don't have a bus stop every block, or if you do, only stop there half the times. DONT LET CROSSWALKS RULE ROADS.

Drivers pay to register their cars and pay gas tax. They should see benefits for those fees. Not bike lanes and bike boxes at the intersections.

I always think it is a good idea to make existing roads safer, in good repair and connected. We must always consider usage numbers and if a road has a high number of problems (rutting from truck traffic), age of road, and safety issues those of course must be addressed.

I enjoy walking my dog. I often wish to take longer rambles with him, but the unsafe conditions of many streets makes this difficult. I am primarily talking about the lack of sidewalks on so many streets in the region.

Maintaining and improving existing roadways.

Other than repair, I think we have a pretty decent road system at this time. However, I do think that the burden of cost on unimproved residential streets should not be on the shoulders of the residents.

Start with low-cost additions of lanes that don't require expensive bridges, retaining walls, bike lanes, artwork, etc.

Start with paving unpaved streets. Make all streets sidewalk friendly, and make safe crossing.

The main use of the roads and how traffic will grow.

Use money wisely, hold contractors responsible for proper work and when surfaces fail they redo at no cost. Too many street repairs fall apart 6 months later.

Usage, is there a high volume of incidents or accidents concerning a particular road or area.

What areas are underserved now.

Make roads more bike friendly.

More lanes where there are bottlenecks. Repair places that cause problems like the infamous road connection that sticks up and causes wrecks in NW Portland. Also, the congestion on I-5 north could be helped by better traffic management on the exits. An additional bridge over the Columbia would be good—not a replacement for I-5 but an additional one.

N/A

Safety, congestion and scheduled maintenance plans.

Strive to be pro transit without being anti car.

Talk to the people who are going to be impacted by any new construction, ask for suggestions, keep the people engaged in all aspects of the construction phase. Ask for their opinion on what needs to be done before making decisions that impact all of the traffic.
We are not New Yorkers that have had a great system of transit for over 100 years. Automobiles are the preferred method of transit for the vast majority of people. I could get to transit, but it is inconvenient and expensive.

Widening selected streets should be done only through stringent criteria that demonstrate bottlenecks or congestion that may not be corrected in any other way. Traffic calming is effective and enhances neighborhood livability, and should be the preferred method for keeping streets safe and moving vehicles and people efficiently.

Consider the locals. So often, I see your road "improvement" projects make it difficult for the locals, causing extra miles and gas usage. Who do you think uses these roads the most?

Integration of surface street improvements with better walking and bicycle access. Sometimes an improvement for one form of traffic interferes with an existing improvement for another. Better planning!!

The first priority should be to make it easier for motorized vehicles to get around over bikes and pedestrians.

This already receives too much weight.

Think about the local people, most of the recent projects I have seen are thinking regionally and then really mess the road up for the local residents.

Do not widen streets-- it just draws drivers out and the streets fill up. Do not build a single housing unit that does not have, within the building, off-street parking. Smart stop lights--reduce time idling. One-way streets, no left turns on two-way streets. Fill the cracks and potholes, and do not allow contractors to do shoddy fill-ins of street work excavations.

Continue the smart signs and efforts to create a faster pathway between east and west metro area.

Educate the public as to where money comes from for road repair. Most believe it comes from their income and property taxes, and do not trust government to spend additional dedicated tax revenue on actually maintaining streets and highways.

Most good for the most people. This should include sidewalks and bike ways as well as cars.

Safe roads are more important than road expansion.

The roads we now have are not doing the job and we need new and better routes!

Use the gas taxes only for this.

Include bioswales, pervious surfaces, wildlife corridors, overpasses, NO culverts.

The majority of the populace drives. More emphasis should be placed on how to enhance the method of travel that is preferred by the majority.

96% of people use cars. Make that easy and convenient.
A west side connector, like 205 on the east side, is desperately needed for the fastest growing area in Portland Metro.

Although environmentalists would like to reduce automobile travel, it is still the predominant mode of travel used by the majority of the population (the tax paying population). More of our money should be spent on this goal.

Don’t hire union shops only. You make these projects for much less money.

Driving on roads is how people get around, there is no changing that. Keeping roads in good condition and large enough to handle not just the amount of traffic now but in the future as populations grow and shift is of the utmost importance.

Examine accident data, review traffic patterns at peak times, and then propose and implement the best solutions to keep roadways safe, passable, and user-friendly.

Highway systems need to remain the primary focus.

This is the true backbone of our economy, more people and goods are shipped on roads than by any other method. More roads leads to greater efficiency.

Use motor vehicle and fuel taxes for their intended purpose, not pet projects not strictly related to keeping roads in good shape and accommodate growth by building new roads as needed.

Yes, but not much more. We do need maintenance but as people take public transit, bikes etc more we won't need to have so much in terms of new roads.

Better signage before entering a congested area; steep fines for trucks that exceed the speed limit; have a lower speed limit for trucks and enforce it.

Build sidewalks.

I support this, but I realize money only goes so far, but we still need to maintain our streets and recognize population growth.

Making roads safe and reliable are important. But preventive road maintenance should be the highest priority, with funding for road improvements (new connections) allocated only when the major road system is well maintained. Again, do not prioritize improvements over maintenance.

The most widely traveled, most used streets should get the most money.

This would be my highest priority and largest investment, to invest in roads as the solution to alleviate congestion.

Who could answer no to such a question but the streets widened needs to support problems not facilitate sprawl - which has been the case.

Yes, the road network still needs to work - people still need to get around and the vast majority will only ever rely on their private car. We are a pampered, spoiled society.
AVOID MAJOR THROUGHFARES AND NEW CONNECTING STREETS SMACK THROUGH ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS UNLESS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY THE IMPACTED HOMEOWNERS.

Current & expected future congestion. Budgets & how to get work done efficiently with low overhead - something Oregon's extremely bad about.

Do not let any connector become a major road through a currently quiet neighborhood... and you can't just pay cheap prices to buy peoples homes to accomplish widening and putting roads through where you want them.

Growth over the next 10 to 15 years. How about some car pool lanes on 26? We don't need it wider.

I feel that roads that since roads are in use already for main transportation and that fact won't change in the near future that we need the resources to repair and sustain what's needed for traveling. If roads aren't repaired it's dangerous for everybody. If roads don't keep up with the throughput of the growing community than it's dangerous because people are impatient and weave in and out of traffic or rush through neighborhoods and create congestion for emergency vehicles.

I travel the valley giving riding lessons to adults and kids at their barns. I am on the road a lot and hate the areas with big pot holes or that are not even paved! Pave the roads in the hills please!

Maintenance is just as (if not more) important as new connections.

Road closures, road use, routing possibilities.

Road widening should be the last resort. Maintenance should be the highest priority.

Safe, well-maintained, and appropriately-sized highways are essential to the economy. They need to keep pace with the needs of the growing population centers.

Targeted additional roadway capacity is needed to fuel regional growth and funding for multimodal transportation projects. Often these enhancements are for people yet to move to the region, so their voice can be lost in the NIMBY crowd. More explanation of how SDCs work at the neighborhood level is necessary to help with understanding of how funding generated can stay in the immediate neighborhood (voluntary conditions of approval) versus an agency moving them to another geographic location.

This should be given lower priority except on major streets. Incentives should favor less driving.

We need to improve the current gridlock that seems to occur during commute hours daily in our region. The vast majority of citizens need to be able drive to various locations.....not every one can take mass transit every day for each trip.

Westside bypass is long overdue.

Yes! And doing this in anticipation of growth is better than doing it when our streets/highways are at a crisis point of disrepair and/or dysfunction.

Need to repair and maintain what we have before we make improvements or expand.
This needs to be done in the most cost efficient means possible. That would include dropping the prevailing wage requirements so that the public could see an increase in the diversity of bidders on these projects.

I support safe highways, but more investment should be made in alternatives to the automobile. Do not spend funds widening roads for the purposes of walking or biking lanes. Rather, widen them for more auto use.

Again, better strategy. We built a two-lane w/center turn road between Tualatin and Sherwood. It was bottle-neck the day it opened. Get your Matchboxes out and tried it before you build it.

Having trucks and cars sit or move so slowly that they become inefficient is not cost effective for local/regional businesses and creates more pollution and climate issues than a properly maintained and correctly sized road system.

It is time to invest more $$ in our transportation infrastructure that does not include light rail.

More roads are not needed. We need to alter our roadways to make them safe for all users, not just drivers.

More streets with more throughput means less time wasted in traffic.

Multiple routes to same destinations important. i.e.. trying to get to Kaiser Hospital on 205 during rush hour. Good repair helps prevent accidents and avoids law suits which are costly. More traffic = more accidents.

No glass on bike lanes....clean more often and respond when reported....we NEED this to get to work on time!

Stop raising taxes.

That's a very broad policy. The priority is that streets need to be in good repair. If we then focus on mass transit, we could get by with less of the other issues in this policy.

Widen and build more roads to streamline traffic flows.

A growing population requires increased transportation access and choices for freight mobility, road capacity, commuter travel, public safety, system reliability and modal choices.

A priority for local and county governments to work together to provide these safer streets and roads.

Building separated lanes from cars and pedestrians for bicycles and fine those who violate their respective lanes, e.g. no bikes on roads where there are lanes and no mopeds, etc. on bike areas.

But why are you saying investment when you really mean higher taxes.

Certain intersections and neighborhoods in Portland seem to have an inordinate number of pedestrian/car accidents. Target them first.

Competitive contracting.

Environmental impacts.

I support the safe, reliable, & connected part but am against too much improvement for car traffic. Streets should not be widened unless so narrow only one car can go on them. Ideally, the city should develop techniques for slowing cars in town & reducing car usage in town.
Improve travel lanes for cars/buses/trucks.

Increasing safety and improving maintenance of existing road systems is great. Expansion is a fools errand, and contradictory to other improvements in liveability and accessibility.

Keep roadways in perspective as only one, and not the primary, transportation mode.

Keeping the road system in good repair and building a well-connected system of streets and through-ways.

Less of a priority than improving transit and active transportation network.

Maintaining neighborhoods—not widening streets which would harm neighborhood cohesiveness.

Maintenance & repair of the road system we have (minimal improvements) is a prerequisite investment before further improvements/development for biking & transit. Should come out of the same revenue.

Maintain neighborhoods, not widening streets which would harm neighborhood cohesiveness.

Make sure new development does not get approved without addressing the traffic it will generate.

Making it easier to use cars should be the lowest priority.

Not privileging private cars (and on-street car storage aka parking) over other modes. Preserving/restoring the street grid.

Pave the unpaved streets. Are we a third-world city?

People and the public transportation should be given priority in keeping streets safe, etc.

Prioritize areas for special attention.

Spend more money on streets that will facilitate auto travel.

The prime dictate here should be to continue to restrict the use of roads for single-occupancy vehicles. Roads need to be kept in a moderately good state, but mass transit and pedestrian improvements should take much higher priority. The gas tax needs to be raised to further encourage this.

The roads need to be kept in good working area as many folks can not walk/bike/bus to work.

This is a good idea, but lower priority for me than upgrades to public transit and building sidewalks.

Try to keep truck and other commercial traffic off small streets.

Use your brains to balance your budget and prioritize. Do not keep asking tax payers to pay more and more for necessities while money is spent on would-be-nice items such as street cars, office improvement, and travel...especially out of the country.

What traffic needs to be using what streets and when. Creating obvious travel corridors that support efficient car travel, separating them from bike and pedestrian traffic when necessary. Make sure commercial vehicles can get where they need to go, and not endanger or disrupt other travelers.

Agreed.

An improved transition from I-5 to Powell Blvd and Sandy Blvd corridors would be a possible way to reduce traffic on I-84, while reducing travel times across East Portland.

Balancing this investment with much higher gas taxes to discourage use of single commuter cars.
Building a long-term strategy with specific steps that can be easily explained to the general public.

Carbon tax.

Changing commute patterns through incentives rather than just widening streets.

Consider where this money will come from. Some people and families, though they need these things, cannot afford higher taxes.

Developing a stable source for funding transportation projects.

Don't make things too convenient for personal autos! Reward carpooling and transit use and make driving less handy.

Emphasis on maintenance, not widening.

Enforce truck policies; get the gigantic semis back onto the correct streets and out of our residential neighborhoods.

Equity and traffic volume. Put sidewalks and roads where there are none first (i.e. in communities with lower incomes) then repair the highest volume roads.

Focus on repair of main traffic arteries first. I wish the enforcement of cell phone usage was better, as a pedestrian it is sometimes worrisome wondering if the person is aware of their surroundings or just what's in front of them. Personally, if I lived on a potholed dirt or gravel road I would be happy knowing their is little traffic.

Focus on safety improvements, calming streets (example, Division St) instead of just making them wider/faster.

Good repair = good, not necessarily ultra-smooth, ultra-expressway, ultra-fast, snappy, etc. Well-connected does not necessarily mean more flying ramps, cutoffs, cureless, cut-through-the-sliding-mountains connected. Targeted widening a last resort, not a first inspiration.

How do these street and highway investments serve to reduce automobile use and increase transit use.

I concur that we need to make our roads safer and keep vehicle drivers from hurting, maiming, and killing others, but I don’t think that happens with wider streets and highways.

I DO not think the policy of Portland transportation to narrow streets to one lane from 2 lanes is a good idea. It just adds to more exhaust in the air as more cars are just idling at lights, etc. It does not reduce the congestion. It just creates frustration and air pollution. And then the side streets get more cars on it even though they are more narrow and residential. Also it seems that no one is ticketed for looking at their cell phones or talking on them esp on the side streets.

I don't know what "targeted widening of streets and highways" means. I would be careful about adding more lanes to our highway system. Keeping local streets well-connected is important.
I feel that expanding roadways, and widening them isn't as much needed in the Portland Metro area. But the infrastructure we have currently (bridges and roads) need to be maintained for safe travel by car, truck, bike and walking.

I hardly drive at all but we need to maintain infrastructure. Taxes based on miles driven needs to be instituted.

I think it's important to make our streets as safe as possible, but I hope that more focus is made on public transit and active transportation. Having less cars on the road will make our streets and highways safer. Widening our highways will only make it easier for people to travel by car and give people excuses (that includes me) not to walk, bike, or take the bus.

I'll believe it when I see it.

I'm not sure in what cases widening of streets and highways is appropriate. Historically adding lanes has not solved traffic issues, as more people buy cars and quickly consume the increased capacity. I also find that with every additional lane added, the safety of the street seems to decrease... i.e. Street is more difficult to cross, speeds are higher, street is less favorable for pedestrians in general.

Improve connectivity - including occasional new roads - to reduce the need to widen existing roads.

Improving what we have rather than building more or bigger. Planning for multi modes, not just cars.

Increase car registration fees. More cars in a household more fees.

Increase registration fee on new cars.

Keep the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists in mind when planning street/highway networks.

less support than for other policies; goal should be climate-neutral.

lighting community safety congestion alternative transportation uses.

Limit widening, consider road diets. improve connectivity. Slow down driving in inner urban areas. Consider equity and air pollution impacts.

Maintain what we have. Make safety improvements. DO NOT ADD to the road network except minimally. Increase usability by pedestrians and cyclists. Make ADA improvements.

Maintenance of existing is a priority.

Maintenance of streets is important for all modes.

Other modes of transportation should have a higher priority than widening of streets and highways, unless that is for safety.

Pave unimproved roads.

Planning in a sensible order--e.g. there are streets in my neighborhood that are in dire need of repaving, while streets that are in fine condition get repaved. Why?
Please consider using technology to give busses preferential treatment with respect to traffic light timing. Please consider implementing designated bus lanes at traffic choke points. If busses can be given some advantage in dealing with traffic jams, people will be more inclined to take the bus as opposed to driving.

Population density, traffic counts.

Prioritize the infrastructure. First eliminate all the cars & bikes from downtown then those streets don't need mending. Concentrate on high traffic streets, widen them & build the bike ways. Mend the inner city streets widening them as needed, taking property from lots on narrow essential streets. Rework all zoning. Keep the historic neighborhoods & repair infrastructure. Install pavers in all parking lots for optimum aquifer refreshment. see earlier comment.

Repair damaged unpaved roads in neighborhoods before they become irreparable without great expense. Better distribute available resources. It seems like fancy neighborhoods get street sweeping, leaf collection and everything else, while I have to repair broken engine mounts because my street has HUGE potholes and sewer caps sticking up 4 or more inches out of the road.

Roads should be kept in good repair, but road widening and new roads should be minimized. More bike lanes and bike/ped accommodations are vital.

Safe and maintained. I do not care as much for speed, efficiency, car centric policies.

Since planning of work to where you live is so poorly done. I guess this is the only alternative.

Some kind of user fees/taxes should pay for it.

Street and road repair are the first places to start so this policy has a chance of success.

Street have to be kept up, neighborhoods safe from speeding cars.

Streets and highways should be maintained to prevent deterioration.

Streets should be maintained, but not necessarily widened. The emphasis should be on encouraging more alternative forms of transportation, e.g. walking/biking/transit, as opposed to making more room on the roads for cars.

The bottom lines, is that car will be around for a long time. The better repair, and the more efficient are roads are, the less impact on the environment (due to waster fuel and time).

The governmental agencies must keep up with maintenance of roads and not depend on floating repeated bond issues for maintenance that should have been done. Large business should bear their share of road maintenance costs because of increased traffic and delivery usage to their business.

The impact of road construction on people living in areas where businesses are blooming and traffic is increasing. Keeping parks, trees, yards, vegetation around these increasingly used roads. SE Division for example is exploding with new businesses and more traffic. Making this area better in terms of accessibility and repaving streets is definitely needed, but keeping vegetation around seems pretty important, as well as considering the people that live in the immediate area and how construction will impact them.
This is really complicated. Streets should be thoughtfully marked to allow traffic to flow. This is vital for a country like the U.S.

To avoid the new blinking lights on crosswalks as to distracting ...looking at lights instead of the person in crosswalk. Not all roads should have a line taken from bike lane. For planners to realize that there will be cars on major streets and if they slow it up w/ 'making it safer' ..then the cars will find another street that was quiet but now has traffic . The City of PDX planners do not realize that it seems. Division St is a good example of not planning of side streets becoming a major street.

Traffic patterns should be considered and high traffic areas and potential for traffic jams should be predicted as best as possible. Making sure the neighborhood understands the rationale is important and going beyond just the neighborhood association because not everyone can be involved in the neighborhood association. Sometimes the rationale behind street connection doesn't make sense to me and seems like it will make things worse.

Unfortunately, until we have excellent mass transit we will have most people driving to work. The mass transit must be very good to accommodate them. Or, Portland can lead the way in helping people grow wealth without buying a house.

We need to reduce traffic but also to maintain the infrastructure. That means putting public money into it. We should always provide options for future additions of public transportation. We should keep existing roads in good repair but should not expand roads. bigger roads means bigger sprawl and more cars! If driving is too easy, people will live far away and choose to drive over other forms of transit.

Who primarily benefits from roadways and streets, these parties should bear the burden of expenses on maintaining the streets. Other regions that use local streets and roadways as 'pass-thru' transportation channels should also be required to contribute to maintenance of these roadways.

Yes, especially when keeping roads in good repair serve the interests of motorists and bicyclists alike. Roads without potholes benefit everyone, and taking time to install bike lanes, paths, and/or sidewalks when repairing streets is a good use of resources.

Yes, of course I do, but no new streets are needed - just repair the ones we already have. If you make them Complete Streets - which should be the goal of all street repairs going forward - then that will solve many other problems as well. http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/complete-streets-fundamentals/complete-streets-faq.

Coordinate with transit and active transportation strategies. They cannot be separated from road/street planning.
Don't build more freeways and roads that only encourage traffic and congestion. Also, take into account that car usage is going down generationally, and that the long-term increase in oil prices will inevitably have an effect on vehicle usage over time (i.e., don't build with the anticipation that traffic will remain at current levels).

Driving is most convenient for me, so yes I definitely support this option. Many drivers to day are driving distracted. All signs, lights and signals should be clearly marked and VERY obvious.

Minimal impact to existing neighborhoods and green spaces.

No more streets just keep existing ones in repair.

Obviously, removing the need for individual auto travel with a strong public transportation system. In terms of street maintenance, Make sure that wealthy institutions like University of Portland (for instance) pay for the use of Portsmouth Avenue by the heavy equipment needed for each of their expansion projects.

Of course it is important to maintain roads, but I do not favor widening roads as traffic will only increase. It is better to improve options for transit, carpooling, and biking than to expand roads.

Safety first 100% of the time. Need to strive for seismic preparedness.

With the proviso that widening roads into arterials for higher traffic flow has a permanent negative impact on neighborhoods and places too great an emphasis on what should be a short-term problem. Building infrastructure assuming that people and goods will continue to be transported in the way of the 20th century is short-sighted.

Adding a lane to a road and having more cars on the road can be better for the environment than having fewer cars stuck in traffic. But emphasis should be put on shared use of the roads.

Establish a miles driven tax and/or change auto licensing fees based on value of car. Proceeds to be used only for transportation roads.

Making this a budgetary priority instead of always specially taxing for it.

We simply need to expand our road capacity. Cars are not evil, particularly if we emphasize electric and hybrid vehicles as a community. This medium-sized metro area has the traffic bottlenecks of a large city, which reduces efficiency and harms our economy.

Widening streets without ensure pedestrian and bicycle safety will contradict other stated priorities.

Emphasis on connected. Smaller traffic lanes on non-arterial streets, and connecting through some of the megabucks in areas that were developed with rural roads for connectivity... even if it means buying an occasional house to put a connecting local street through.

Coordinate with other modes of transportation to decrease need for frequent upgrades.
Make no investments in streets or highways without ensuring the investments enhance the walking and cycling experience.

More street lighting.

Motivate people use public transportation system... in high truck/transport traffic corridors separate or other wise provide high volume restricted lanes for trucks and buses.

Repairing streets yes, I’m not sure we need more connectors.

Wayfinding signs advertising alternate routes.

Widenings should happen only to make wider sidewalks with street trees and for bike lanes--not for more cars, as that is a never-ending catch 22.

You can't plan or legislate people out of their cars but I dont necessarily agree with the reasoning or choices given in the extra info on this section. If all streets in a grid are made available to cars then they become dispersed, reducing congestion on single "thoroughfares" and making it safer for bicycles and pedestrians alike. Traffic calming on all streets help in that regard as well.

Agreed, not everyone can ride a bike or take transit. Some people have jobs that require travel and use of a vehicle. some families need to locate so that both adults can access their work. Let's look at resolving problems that contribute to congestion, allowing PPS students to attend school anywhere in the district adds significantly to regional congestion, this easily noticeable during the summer months. Stop allowing people to attend public school on the other side of the City, my neighborhood school has a large influx of people from outside the neighborhood, this is noticeable during the morning and afternoon, as there way too many people picking up and dropping off their kids.

Another good and sensible goal. How will it be funded? I don't agree with street and highway widening because of the "Build it and they will come" phenomenon. Car drivers need incentive to get off the roads--the fewer cars on the road, the less road repair will be needed.

Better signage, particularly where motorists interact frequently with pedestrian and bikers. Much more enforcement of pedestrian crosswalk laws.

Bike route roads should be a particular target of repair--many routes on side streets are full of potholes, etc.

Connected local streets are vital for supporting local traffic and building communities centers that are more than auto-oriented strip retail. Funding the creation and expansion of these local street grids should be a high priority.

Cost benefit analysis.

Good repair, not so much widening or well-connecting.

I do NOT support the widening of highways.
I only understand that this directly contributes to climate smart goals by reducing congestion and making roads accessible to bikes and peds as well as cars, and streamlined for transit. I don’t want to invest in a road system meant only for cars.

I would say yes to this with the caveat that we must expand mass transit options to reduce the need for upgrading, expanding or encouraging mo auto use.

If we have roads, they should be maintained and safe. This includes making safe crosswalks for pedestrians and cyclists on major thoroughfares.

Less of a priority, but still important. especially resurfacing for better fuel efficiency and tire wear... Better yet, MAKE STUDDED TIRES ILLEGAL in the metro area.

Maintaining existing.

Maintenance is #2. #2 must be actually paving many of the unpaved streets in outer SE Portland.

Make current road repair/maintenance a first priority. Take serious measures to block neighborhood shortcut routes, with input from each community.

Maximizing traffic flow.

Multimodal is good.

Need to look closer at areas where the highways tend to clog and make it more workable. Examples are hwy 26 from ross island bridge to 405 to the tunnel, and interstate 5 southbound where a lane ends then 2 merge right before the 84/30 exit.

No suggestions.

Not sure.

Only focus on maintenance and safety, not capacity expansion, which is counter to our climate goals.

Smoothing the highway / feeder road interfaicer.

Stop "road diets" and use the lanes for transit and or HOV. Every lane that is lost is a penalty fr bus users.

Synchronization of lights in re: funding -- tap the feds; get together with metro regions around the country and lobby together to stop wasting so much money on wars (for the profits of a few) and start investing in community infrastructure, which we as a nation would be able to afford if we had our priorities straight.

Taxes on small businesses and residents. Also, will trees and plants be removed for this.

The environment.

This is number one--we are far behind in maintaining the transportation infrastructure we already have.

Truck and car registration tax to pay for maintenance.

Use technology to its full extent.

Yes, but improve (not widen or build more) roadways for commerce and freight movement. We do not need more roads, highways or freeways, but we need our existing roadways to be in excellent condition.

Yes, with emphasis on road diets and overall lowering speed limits within the city.
Ability to maintain streets in good condition.

Build more freeway lane miles. Increase speed limits. Use high tech signal timing. HOT lanes.

Continue to work on traffic flow by changing streets to one way, or fewer lanes to accommodate shared bike + car + pedestrian use.

Cost.

Efforts to increase safety are the highest priority. Major road expansions should not.

Equity, environmental impacts.

I am more in favor of mass transit but we also need to keep our streets safe with good signs, good traffic flow for less emissions, and making sure emergency vehicles can get around easily.

I don't support widening of highways in most cases. Increased capacity just leads to increased use as people are not longer incentivized to find alternative means of travel to reduce travel time.

Making more room for cars should not be at the top of the list however. We should tread very carefully when making car access easier.

Please consider tolling, or other kinds of user fees to support investments in a way that may also allow for congestion management.

Prioritize routes to employment areas - people need to get to work safely and easily.

Remember that delaying repairs costs more in the long run.

So streets and highways seem reliable - but bike access is not.

This should be built into the budget. Raise gas taxes if necessary.

This should be the number one priority. For the politicians, bureaucrats, and pundits whose goal is to make traffic so bad that it forces people to choose walking, biking, or transit as the alternative I have two words: SCREW YOU! This is asinine - having heavy traffic congestion has a huge negative impact on livability. Removing a lane for vehicular traffic on busy NW Everett to install a bike lane is absolutely stupid - and, as a tax payer, makes me furious. Let people decide if they want to bike, walk, or take public transit - don't de-facto force this.

We have enough roads and except for I5 that runs through the city the present lanes amounts are adequate. I5 does need help especially around the I5/I84 interchange area and Moda center plus I5 bridge. More lanes are needed there. However, we do need to keep up or maintain what exist and perhaps certain improvements are necessary.

We need more lanes for vehicular traffic in many spots in the city and metro area. Another bridge or more lanes between Vancouver and Portland are desperately needed. The ridiculous plans for improving the I-5 bridge without adding far more lanes is absolutely nuts. Maybe a better solution would be to add another bridge either near NE 30th or out near Gresham.
Enforce ped right of way at all cross walks. Enforce full and complete stops by cars at intersections BEFORE car enters cross walk or intersection.

Expanding existing highways, i.e. increasing number of traffic lanes, should not be an option.

Fix existing problems, don’t just create new stuff because it’s easier. Take I5 for instance - regardless of the bridge to Washington is busy or not, traffic always comes to a standstill AFTER the bridge, as there are two lanes going through the heart of the city, which is dumb. And the carpool lane going north is dumb, but probably gets federal dollars. Should consider something like the Express Lanes in Seattle - in the morning, extra lanes go south and few go north. In the afternoon, it switches, because that’s the direction most cars are going.

Good repair is more important than widening streets and highways so more cars can use them. Emphasis should be on lessening the number of cars and increasing the safety of the roads we have.

I support this but not as much as investing in transit and alternative modes of transportation. Yes, we need a good road system but we have a good one that needs maintenance more than we need new roads or highways.

I'd really like to respond both yes and no. Yes, we need road repairs. But, no, we don't need more roads. Better intersection design is a must. Getting cars off the roads is a better priority than building more or wider roads. Get serious about who pays and how. I support a higher gas tax, a downtown fee like London’s for driving in the core and a toll on the interstate bridge. Should be no problem fixing roads with the income from the three sources.

Maintain the roads we have before building more.

Most people still have cars and use them so please put the focus here.

Portland Metropolitan area is growing dramatically. As much as I prefer the investment go to pedestrian and bicycle routes, we can't ignore the roads in disrepair and overall congestion that will only get worse. We need to invest in this area, too.

Portland's streets condition is awful. Repairing them should be a priority over new initiatives.

Prioritize repairs need to be made rather than widening highways and streets. Neighborhood streets being used as collectors should be "local access only" instead of through ways to other destinations thus preserving our neighborhoods.

Separate cars, bikes and pedestrians car drivers act entitled to use the streets, crosswalks and drive up onto the sidewalks as they try to operate machinery while distracted.

Start with all potholes, then replacing & replacing where needed, then paving new roads. Also anytime a building goes up around town, the builder needs to replace/pave road around it after using the cranes instead of just filling a pothole - they tear up road more than is recognized.
Study traffic patterns and accident reports to target needs. Aim to reduce congestion and improve the flow of traffic by repairing (and paving) roads and considering changes to traffic light timing.

Take money from other "priorities" such as "investments" and subsidies for "green" projects.

The balance of investment toward 4-wheeled vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles and pedestrians. Too much emphasis is put on supporting 4-wheeled/car travel needs.

The idea that over 95% of transportaion and commerce needs are auto or truck related should be the number one consideration.

This is a mother and apple pie question as are the others. These elements are part of the transportation system. It is never clear that there is integration among the various government units that these elements are recognized. I would start with a "super" administrative unit that has responsibility and ability, taxes, to manage such a system.

Where is the money? And, maybe, could these questions have a little less pablum? Who is against safe, reliable and connected? Really!

Better timing on lights, less stop and go.

But please don't cut down the beautiful 100 year old trees on my street to widen it.

Carbon Tax.

Consistency would be a great place to start! Green lights with count downs should all be the same....now some change at zero and others stay green for another 5 seconds. Remove as many in town stop signs as possible and replace with circles/rotaries...quieter, safer and better for gas mileage. Remove those awful curbs that stick out at intersections. Print street signs on BOTH sides! Put consistent signs in ADVANCE of entrance ramps - with clues about which side of the street the entrance ramp will be placed. Oregon is the only state where I've driven that requires the driver to know in advance which lane is the proper lane to be in to proceed where they'd like to go, block to block. Also find it incredible that police never direct traffic --- never!

Do a good job of maintaining them. Paving, striping and good crosswalks.

Ensuring the bike lanes and walking areas are not forgotten to make way for more cars or more retail space. Often times there are poorly maintained bike lanes or very dark streets which make walking feel unsafe.

Financing is a huge issue, but roads & infrastructure are in bad shape and need updating.

I consider this a lower priority as we need to get more people on bikes and buses so there will be less traffic and less pressure to build parking lots.
I only support if bike and ped. improvements are also required. Metro should not be funding road widening, new roads, etc. Local governments need to take care of maintenance and if their constituents want more then they should pay for it themselves through street fees or other funding mechanisms. For highways, ODOT and the State need to find the political will to raise gas tax and/or find more creative ways to fund these projects. That said, regional funds should go toward intersection improvements that are needed to address regional growth, eg. to alleviate safety issues and congestion due to development down the road, so to speak.

I want streets & highways safe but I also want the focus on getting us OFF of them as much as possible.

I would focus on making high-traffic streets in good repair and wider. Figure out how to discourage bike traffic on such roads.

I'm not sure about "more investment" but smarter investment is called for. Mass transit can play a role in preventing more and more congestion. I've lived in Portland for over 4 decades and traffic has increased dramatically on the city and area's streets and highways. Highways abhor a vacuum so building more and more won't solve the problems. I'm all for figuring out a way to have commuters (and shoppers avoiding sales tax) from Vancouver and area pay a fair share of all the congestion they cause.

Improve yes, significantly enlarge capacity, no.

Income taxes for city/county residents - a better idea for the road fee than a per-household street fee. Increase gas taxes as well - easier to do now while prices are down.

Keeping the existing roads in good repair, period.

Maintain streets so they do not become such a huge repair burden.

Monies that we have been told that we were paying for all along have not been used for our roads why should we continue with new fees when funds are not being directed the right way.

PDX Government won't like it but improved roads & highways are critical to regional growth.

Portland needs to pave its remaining 52 miles of unpaved city streets... the current situation is an obstacle to bikes, pedestrians, and wheelchairs, and is outright dangerous (not to mention embarrassing!). The region must come up with an adequate funding mechanism to provide *consistently* adequate $$ for road repair/maintenance, but not road expansion. It's vital to link planning to road capacity, to avoid new commercial developments overwhelming existing roads.

Reducing automobile traffic should be a top priority so that roads don't have to be widened (perhaps they could be narrowed and/or reduced in number).

Repair financing, lane expansion. NEW VISTA RIDGE TUNNEL!

Repair infrastructure without raising taxes.

Safety 1st followed by comfort, as in I drive a Miata and I HATE POTHOLES cause they hurt my back!

Safety first.

Secondary to better public trans, sidewalks and bike lanes.
Special attention is needed when cyclists have to make turns or cross intersections. Somehow make bike lanes visible through intersections. Mostly for the benefit of cars so they realize that they are sharing the road.

Start with Interstate 5 and the Columbia River Crossing and work outward from there. It is obscene that one cannot plan on uncontested travel any time of day in the I 5 corridor.

Sustainability of hyperlocal economies.

Systems should be maintained but not expanded unless traffic flow issues justify expansion priority should be on other means of transportation.

Taxes on nonrenewable transportation fuels followed by progressive taxation in other areas.

the connections in portland are pretty poor; by that i mean obviously the bridges across the willamette, but also connections between north and south where all the streets jog over and then back and there are relatively few through streets. then there are speed bumps. i deplore speed bumps. they are difficult to see in the rain (especially after a few seasons) and you have to slow down even more than the speed limit which makes people speed up between them to balance out. the small circles are a much nicer way to slow people down. speed bumps are a pain in the neck, literally!

The focus should be on maintaining existing roadways, not building tons on new ones.

The impact on neighborhoods.

There seem to be a lot of roads in bad shape. I notice it, in particular, when riding my bike over the rough roads.

This spending should be balanced by equally important spending on public transportation and bike use. Where goals for each of these cross over more attention should be paid.

Use and reallocate existing funds.

While I support making streets and highways safe, we do NOT need more highways. Alternative methods of transportation should be improved so that it is easier to commute from Portland metro outward, rather than increasing the size of our highways.

Widening roads will induce more travel and set the region back on meeting its climate goals.

Blend in the street repairs and modifications at the sametime. Don’t spread them out so the streets have to be repaired then torn up and repaired for each thing do it once and get all the jobs done.

Determine where the choke points are and work at making improvements that will make an impact to the flow of traffic. Prioritize.

Do not invest in new or wider streets at the expense of other transportation options. Fix bad streets and evaluate which neighborhoods are disadvantaged by dangerous streets and prioritize them.

Don’t widen the streets! Do keep them in good repair and safe.

Equity for all communities including East Portland.
Face facts - the majority of regional transportation is by auto. Maintenance first, then selective widening.

Fixing potholes saves tires and is worth the money if for no other reason.

Focus on keeping the existing network in good repair, focus more on technology than expanding infrastructure.

Gosh, this is where it gets hard - balancing tax dollars against bikes and transit to keep roads in good repair. More magic wands!

I certainly believe we need to maintain our existing road and highway system. I am less enthusiastic about widespread widening of streets and highways since we know it will only encourage more automobile traffic. Targeted widening probably makes sense, but this should be done very thoughtfully.

I do not support increasing the size or number of roads. I do support speed bumps use, as they slow traffic, which saves lives.

I support increased services to ensure CURRENT infrastructure is kept in good repair. I do not support significant increases in new construction of streets and highways except where existing neighborhoods lack paved access.

If the Portland City Council could keep its hands out of the cookie jar, perhaps streets would be in better repair than they are now. Instead, the only answer they can come up with is to add another layer of taxes. Too many years, too many special projects and not enough oversight as to how money is spent. It is unclear how a new road maintenance tax will be spent and on what. What must be considered when implementing policy is how the money will be managed. The word “transparency” is used often and has lost its meaning. There is no transparency when it comes to a pot of money and individuals in power who think too much about their legacy. Can you tell I'm annoyed? There have been far too many years of mismanagement. I'm grateful that Opt In exists, I just hope the responses are actually used to help shape policy.

Improved timing of traffic signals would improve flow and reduce wasteful idling.

Improving existing streets, rather than major new construction projects, should be prioritized.

In general, yes. but not major highway/road expansions. It's important to keep streets safe and in good repair but we have to balance expanding streets/highways with efforts to support transit, biking and walking.

It will likely be difficult to get funding for all the projects wished for in the plan. I think it's better to do a few projects well than to do a lot of projects poorly. Please choose and allocate funds wisely.

Keeping the major arteries in good repair; fix streets in low income areas at the same rate as other in income areas - i.e. not street deserts.

Main thoroughfares, such as Foster Rd., should have safe crosswalks at least every two blocks.

Most people drive because it is faster, cheaper and more convenient. Planners (and METRO) need to recognize this reality. For the car owner, most transit trips are more expensive than driving - the cost of Trimet fare will cover the cost of driving an average car from Gresham to downtown.
Of course I support continuing investment as long as it is spent wisely. But, what does "more" mean? More than we're spending now? This doesn't mean I support increased taxes. You've made some good progress and some serious errors with the current revenue stream. Get away from the .errors and spend what you have wisely.

ONLY PROVEN safety measures should be implemented, That leaves out speed bumps which actually harm people. That leaves out bubble curbs which are un proven. references: http://www.debunkingportland.com/calming.html http://www.debunkingportland.com/observationsontransportpolicy.html

Portland is growing by leaps and bounds. Car drivers should have to pay for the streets and highways they use. Many others who use public transportation and walk, bicycle or use wheelchairs should not be made to pay for these improvements. If there was a fee involved for drivers based on how much they drive they might be more inclined to use public transit.

Portland needs to widen some streets, probably take away people's from yards. That should be fun.

Prioritize safety for all, including pedestrians and cyclists, as well as preservation. Secondary priority for connecting streets where that can be done efficiently. Low priority to other auto capacity.

Quality of roads over quantity - widening can be useful but only as a last resort - while ensuring safe pedestrian activity.

Road diets, ZERO street or highway widening projects.

Road repairs always needed. Consider slowing traffic with speed bumps on major streets like NE Broadway.

Safe and repaired, yes. Wider, no. The only way to discourage more traffic is to make it less convenient and more expensive to drive.

Safety is the most important part of this set, and reliability is actually a subset of safety. "Connected" can mean many things, and I would need to know how you're defining that word.

Safety should be the number one priority.

Safety, adding basic infrastructure in those areas of the city where it has been lacking, speed & ease of connections (a little more consideration for people who need to transit around the city but don't need to go through downtown to reach their destination - spoke & wheel system needs to be supplemented with more of a circle route around the perimeters).

Safety, reliability, and connectivity for PEOPLE (not machines), and most importantly for those people who make the choices that are necessary to contribute to and participate in a sustainable long-term regional transportation strategy.

Street widening should only be done if there are demonstrated benefits.

The economic development achieved by creating construction jobs.
This is a basic function of government. Crumbling infrastructure is embarrassing, dangerous, and bad for business and the environment.

This would be less of a priority than public transit, and safe biking and walking routes.

To some extent. I’ve noticed when highways/freeways become wider with more options, more people drive. That is not a good outcome.

Upgrade pedestrian crosswalks on thoroughfares.

Vast majority of commuting miles and other transportation miles are by cars. Also trucks are needed for transport of most of what we buy - food, etc. Portland especially keeps cramming more people into town, most of whom will drive! Congestion is getting far worse and Portland planners refuse to recognize we drive cars and will continue to do so.

Vision Zero is an important trend sweeping the globe. We must ensure safe streets to reduce auto fatalities, keeping road surfaces in good shape, while saving money and slowing down auto speeds by NOT widening streets and highways (this also will reduce the demand for long auto commutes).

We need to make roads safe for the community.

We need to spend much more on basic road repair—but not the Hales’ new tax—just spend on basic infrastructure out of the city budget. If Portland got back to basics unlike the current pet projects, money would be available. And as to "connected", if this has something to do with the plan to end cul-de-sacs and make them through streets, as a recent op-ed discussed, drop it. Let people on quiet streets stay that way.

We should maintain the road infrastructure we have but be very cautious in any increase in lanes or new roads.

Whatever you can do to improve traffic, do it. This should be the highest priority.

When making changes to established transit modes and resources, THOROUGHLY think about the impact on ALL transit users. Ex: allowing auto traffic to return to, but only use a single lane of 5th & 6th ave downtown was a disaster. Should have just kept cars off. We were used to that! Now you still can't use those streets because you can't turn onto half the streets anyway! you end up circling numerous extra blocks just to get where you want to go. AND: change downtown intersections to two green-light cycles: one for vehicles, and a separate one for pedestrians & bikes. With all the one-ways downtown, an entire lane of cars gets locked at a green light while a pedestrian strollts leisurely across the crossing street and the lead car can't turn! Also: Allow pedestrians to cross diagonally since they are using their own light. Keeps all cars out of the intersection and visa versa when the car’s turn, and eliminates one entire light cycle wait for peds needing to cross two streets. Works great in other cities!

Yes, maintain streets, but invest in more than just car oriented options.
A car operating at a constant speed puts out less emissions than in stop and go traffic. Keep obstructions on streets and roads to a minimum. Eliminate speed bumps. Add left and right turn lanes where possible. Stop all this "road diet" foolishness.

All major roadways should be equipped with vehicle sensors. So that the lights only change for cross traffic when there are vehicles present.

Cost and reducing overall taxes.

Emphasis on highway flow, limiting inter-city car traffic by dissuading car use.

Equitable allocation of improvements to all income areas, residential and commercial, not just those with the most influence.

fees for electric vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles.

Focus on increasing public transit before widening roads, which will only fill up with more traffic unless the other alternatives are there, easy, and safe to use.

Funding should not come from a new general fee or tax but rather through a "per vehicle" fee such as a "city sticker" format.

Higher gasoline taxes. Concentrate on the area that have the highest traffic congestion. Drive on the street to feel the pot holes. More equitable street user fee.

How to do with the existing funds or less - too much has been going to pet projects, resulting in poor condition to the infrastructure and repeated pleas for more money (which is promptly spent elsewhere, restarting the cycle once more).

Investment in infrastructure will create jobs and promote economic growth.

It is especially important to have timed lights to allow vehicle not to have to wait for green lights and connecting the major roads with stops where they are needed for safety. Safety for pedistians should receive major funding.

Keeping traffic flowing with less obstructions reduces vehicle emissions. This must include removing curb extensions where busses board passengers and block traffic - replacing them with bus turnouts so other vehicle traffic can pass. Additionally, to establish equity, motorist paid user fees need to be used exclusively for roads - not bicycle infrastructure and not for transit.

Maintenance should be the priority. Filling in the network next (while also making sure active modes are filled in at the same time). Targeted widening of streets and highways should be at the bottom of the list.

Make intersections as simple and logical as possible.

No widening. Keep it inconvenient to use the car for day-to-day commutes, and make transit very easy to use.
Part of my desire for safety extends to filtering pollutants that come off of the streets. (More swales please!) I also think that the people who do repairs often could fix a (an additional) hole a few feet from ones that they are sent to fix. Often when repairs happen I believe they are in such a hurry to get to the next assignment that they don't look around much - and the time to set up at a given site (their next site) eats into their effectiveness working against a comprehensive strategy. Maybe this is more of an administrative issue than with the work crews, but I think it should be addressed. Too many sewer drains are clogged with soil and/or leaves leading to flooding. If these were proactively addressed they would not be such an issue during larger rain and snow storms.

Plan ahead to be able to "decommission" new or old highways and morph to rapid transit, bike and walking options when car use levels or drops.

Potholes and sustainability.

Proper use of tolls and congestion pricing to help with demand management, while raising funds to maintain and improve the roads.

Reasonable and fair taxes - for example companies should pay their fair share.

Repairs should be the top priority.

Road widening and improvements should not be made at the expense of transit, bike, or pedestrian infrastructure. In all cases, road improvements should result in better access and facilities for ALL modes, not just private cars.

There are lots of places without sidewalks in portland and it's surrounding areas, also unimproved roads could be turned into trails.

This should not increase taxes on low-income and moderate income families (who already are struggling).

When the trade-off is between streets, which encourage cars, and other forms -- mass transit, walking, biking -- then mass transit, walking and biking should take precedence.

Where government money is wasted like locking up people for drugs and the money spent in law enforcement chasing these people. put money save on prison housing of these people and money saved on no longer staffing government workers in that area toward roads and other useful public needs.

A focus on upkeep and repair over expanding or widening streets and highways.

Avoid corruption in awarding contracts, make sure everything is with extreme accountability. So tired of wasted taxpayer money. Politicians think it's "funding." It's not -- it's money the 99% have worked hard for.

Build on the existing network. Add links to Springwater corridor.

But don't ask the public to pay more.

Clear need for more revenue. Invest in good repair, not patchwork that falls apart in a few months even if it responds to the squeaky wheel. Set priorities based on safety, then on vehicle wear and tear.

Complete the many partial interchanges in I-84. This is not California.
Congestion pricing for high traffic areas.

Don't finance it with another destructive, regressive property tax.

Educate the population better about what their taxes are paying for!

Fix the goddamn roads. Stop building bike paths in low use areas and find a way to re-balance resource application to autoways.

Focus more on road repairs before widening of streets. There are many roads throughout the metro area that desperately need repairs.

Focus on safety and network connectivity and completeness, not vehicle capacity.

Focus on social equity. Roads in my nice, inner SE neighborhood get re-paved even when they don't really need it (they're in good to great condition already) while roads in other neighborhoods have major potholes that go unfixed. Do not widen roads if it will just create induced demand. Some level of congestion at certain times is fine - otherwise there's no incentive to use other means of travel.

Fuel consumption tax, not income taxes to pay for our streets.

How can this not be important. But since the majority of the funding goes to this mode, I don't support increasing the percentage of this funding.

I am opposed to widening roads except to accommodate bicycles, transit, and pedestrians.

I favor maintenance over expansion.

I support a moderate increase in road repair costs, but this should be funded without additional taxes, by moving existing tax money from inefficient projects.

If it is true that the street repairs for Portland were taken from a gas tax and we have more hybrid/electric vehicles now, I beg you to come up with a better way to keep up with these changes than a residential tax. I personally do use the roads as a commuter, but what about the elderly on mass transit? It seems that there could be a better way to modernize our economic mechanisms for street repair than to make the cost of living higher in Portland.

If it shunts high commuter traffic and trucks away from walking/biking corridors.

If we eliminated bike lanes on busy streets and bio swells we would have safer streets for motor vehicles. Safety should come first for everyone, not just a chosen few.

Improving the condition of existing streets. Paving or at least regularly maintaining unpaved neighborhood streets (grading and graveling on a regular schedule).

It seems like the region is struggling with identifying the benefit to individual within the whole. For example Clackamas' lack of support for what is a clearly regional Sellwood bridge. Communication needs improvement to demonstrate the benefit to the regional members.
Making it easy to get around. Especially ways to bypass going through the city or those common streets to get anywhere. But ultimately, encouraging driving should not be encouraged. When necessary, though, it should be efficient.

Need for side walks, displacement or residents when new roads are built, change in quality of life for neighborhoods.

No new taxes or fees for consumers or businesses.

Priority should be given to walking, biking and transit over cars.

Priority should be on making a few new connections that reduce the need for big roadway expansions. Rather than widening existing roadways to add more auto lanes, added width should be dedicated to creating balanced multi-modal streets where people can walk and bike and get to the bus. add bikelanes and sidewalks, not more auto lanes. focus on maintain what is built. we do not need more roads, we need better maintained complete streets.

Residential areas need to be protected from motorized vehicle dominant road improvements. Nothing is worse than having your neighborhood street turn into a speedway.

Safe bike lanes should be a priority, making travel by bike safe and convenient also reducing congestion. Existing streets and highways should be well maintained.

Safety.

Safety is critical.

Safety of bikers and pedestrians. There needs to be more flashing lights at crosswalks to alert drivers to pedestrian crossings.

Safety should be the first priority, not speed or improving peak-hour capacity.

See comments in #1. We need public investment to make our streets & highways safe, reliable and connected.

Some parts of East Portland have streets as bad as post Soviet Central Asia. We really need to repair the roads. I think its much more important than more painted bike lanes.

Stop making no left turns, taking out street parking and roads that just end artificially and time the lights so that you don't have to drive longer and idle more.

We should do this in a way that alleviates current problems but doesn't encourage more driving. I particularly like intersections that allow bikes and peds to travel straight, but force cars to turn as a way of keeping cars off of residential roads and bike highways.

Be smart about where the improvements are made so that the same streets aren't torn up the next year for utilities.

Bike riders probably care more about this than I do. The ones I know avoid busy streets and take the back roads and would most likely want a good network of streets outside of heavy traffic areas.
Doing so in a way that integrates mass transit and bike options.

Emphasis should be on upgrading and maintaining existing roads, not building more streets.

Faster, heavier and more numerous vehicular traffic should pay the great majority of maintenance cost. On street parking costs should reflect the real cost of that space. Do not fund road maintenance with parking fines, which is what Portland seems to be trying given the fines they levy.

Financial Impact these investments will have a property tax owners and people who pay taxes. This is a project that should be paid for by a sales tax in Oregon.

Focus on improvements with multiple benefits (bikes, cars and transit) and increase maintenance funds a little bit.

Good repair.

How much money can we get back from State & Fed for roads. We need to stop doing so many studies and build some necessary throughways. This idea that Portland is going to slowly grow is not healthy. We have way more people moving here than projected. Just watch the patterns that drought brings. We need to widen 205 now, not wait for congestion. We need to inspire people with functional transportation options. Waiting an hour for a bus, that you spend a fortune to ride, that takes another 2 hours to get you there, is not a viable solution. Widening key transportation corridors will be essential in combination with well-connected network of streets that are signaled properly.

I believe that keeping current infrastructure in good repair is an important investment. I do NOT believe that money should be spent to add more motor vehicle lanes to existing roads and freeways.

I don't think we should widen arterials. Use signal technology to improve efficiency, repair streets. Reduce speed limits.

I support repair of potholes and buckled pavement to increase safety. I do not support significant investment in or the further development of car infrastructure (i.e. adding more highway lane.).

I support this. HOWEVER, clear safety priorities should be set according to the vulnerability of road users. Pedestrians and bicyclists first. Motorized vehicles last. Streets are places first; means of transportation second.

I would like to see an inversion of the funding for transportation modes. Favor in this order walking, bike, mass transit. Last, single occupant car. It's build it and they will come, so build for the most climate benign form first.

I'd improve connectivity on existing through streets rather than implementing "road diets" on many parallel roadways (e.g., Glisan-Burnside-Division). Without improved mass transit, this just increases dangerous cut-throughs on side streets.

Improve existing roadways and minimize construction of new roadways.
Maintaining safe, pot-hole free roads helps cars and bikes. Priority should be given to alternative transportation projects as enabling more auto traffic is not sustainable with continued growth.

Maintenance only; no new or expanded roadways.

Make more roads and smaller cars with good gas mileage.

Making roadways safer and more connected should NOT include widening and making more roads. Effort to accommodate ever more auto traffic are doomed to failure as any LA planner will tell you.

Only if it times lights for better flow of traffic. An amazing reducer in carbon emissions. Dedicated vehicle arterials.

Revisit the still poorly conceived Portland "street tax."

Several decades of anti-road planning and funding has left these important community resources in bad shape. Roads transport goods as well as people to places that aren't available by transit, walking, or bike. Our road and bridge transportation infrastructure needs a higher percentage of the budget simply to repair what we have; then more on top of that to improve and expand it.

Small local delivery truck access routes. Even apps for companies to use to help drivers navigate best routes for any given time of day. We need to deal with our aging bridges as a region and negotiate funding to maintain our highway systems. Connectors and highways are very important for the folks who rely on them. No matter how many bike lanes we make and improvements to public transportation we have, we need to move greater traffic through the region efficiently. Smaller cities, like Tigard, who refuse light rail should be immediately contracting for commuter/small bus service to get folks through commute efficiently.

That people use them and that lighted streets and fixing portholes would be a really good plan.

The roads here SUCK!

This does not mean the car should rule, as it does now. Disincentives to driving are needed too.

This investment is needed, but should be carefully weighed off against public transit budgeting.

Use fees, before City of Portland income tax for street maintenance. Everyone uses roads and highways not just residents of a certain taxing district.

We need better infrastructure. The new Sellwood bridge will be great. But roads have a lower priority for me than bike lanes and other less polluting forms of transportation.

Yes, but.... Streets need to be safe, reliable and connected but not built out at the expense of transit.

Can we use our current roadways in different ways: express ways, car pool lanes, calibration of traffic lights. Trucking routes that get wider roads. Freeway connections that are improved. NO new roads - just improve what we have.

It's a crime that maintenance of roads has been neglected to the current point. That the City of Portland is putting its hands in our pockets is appalling. Be smart with how money is spent and get priorities straight!
Maintenance should be priority before new building occurs.

Of course, safety is always a priority. The maintenance of our roadways is one thing and that should cover the safety factor. Now, if you want to widen and make major improvements to roadways, I think planning for urban growth in the Metro area is also a good idea. What would really cut down on my travel time each day would be - being able to afford to live closer to my place of employment.

Portland LIKES to build new, but Portland FAILS to maintain anything they do. BUY land for Parks, and have no way to develop nor maintain the parks. NEW rail, yet they can not maintain what the have. Streets are a great example, Schools are another.

The vast majority of citizens use autos to get around during their daily lives. This should be a focus of funding.

A BALANCE between transportation modes, not simply a focus on bicyclists. While I applaud committed bike commuters, this is not an option for many (the disabled, for example). At times Portland has focused so much on bicycles as to leave the rest of the population feeling underserved and alienated.

Better and bigger highways are needed ASAP. Start with rebuilding and adding vehicle capacity through the Rose Quarter area on I-5.

Don't widen lanes when it will promote sprawl or if not really necessary.

Fiscal responsibility.

Getting rid of studded tires for cars (too long of a season for studded tires, few are ticketed for breaking the law, and they do an inordinate amount of damage); widened streets also need bump outs or traffic-slowing devices that are inexpensive, and many crosswalks need islands to actually function safely.

How to keep heavy traffic out of neighborhoods, how to keep certain streets car free or minimize any vehicular traffic.

I support investments that repair and maintain our existing streets. Under no circumstances should we be devoting resources to building new freeways or on other projects that increase capacity for single occupancy vehicles.

I support keeping our roads in good repair, especially making bridges earthquake-safe. But not at the expense of the other projects on this list.

I support maintenance, but am wary of expansion.

I support this but only if it happens in a manner that doesn't just encourage people to drive more.

I want this to be considered...How many streets in Portland aren't paved? that's a safety issue. Please please please start doing this.

Improvements to existing streets and designs and reduce the need for additional routes.

Improving roadways should be focussed on those roads that relieve congestion on bike and transit heavy routes.
Improving routes but not adding more freeway lanes.

Just don't build more, we've got plenty. Maintaining what we have is to be expected, and redesign them to work better.

Keep the streets maintained and don't spend money on streets that do not need it such as portland blvd this past summer.

Lower priority than mass transit, bikes, and pedestrian.

Maximizing existing, underused roads, as bike boulevards. No new taxes, just a designation.

More lanes - and MORE PARKING!

More people moving to the region means we need more roads to connect them. At the same time, building vibrant neighborhoods with great local businesses, parks, restaurants and independent retailers can help reduce our dependence on car travel.

No new highways or high speed through streets. I support improvements to existing roads, but auto dependency must be reduced with increased availability of transportation alternatives and local services. Low cost improvements such as variable signal timing for peak traffic flow. One way couplets, (Couch/Burnside, Williams/Vancouver) seem a great way to improve traffic flow.

No street widening. No new CRC. Street widening does not reduce traffic issues. I highly support a renovation of CRC for multi-modal transit and to reduce the number of lifts required.

Not adding to the expense with Unnecessary Expenses like Bicycle lanes Boulevards and speed bumps.

Repair the roads we have and provide opportunities for single occupancy drivers to use other means of transportation like biking, walking, and public transit.

Road diets, traffic calming and other ways to slow people down, keep traffic local and discourage driving where transit walking and biking should be primary modes of travel in town and in neighborhoods. Discourage cut through traffic from freeways and suburbs and make the infrastructure to and from those regions the best option for thru traffic.

Safety always paramount. w/c ramps imperative.

The annual cost of studded tires and their wear on the roads. Are there reasonable alternatives since the cost of road repair is great.

This should be the City's first priority to maintain the streets we now have and continue to pave the street that are dirt and gravel within the City boundries. We do not need wider streets or highways if we can manage the commuter traffic by having on lane designated as a drive through with no entrance and exit capabilities for a designated stretch of highway. Preferably from the Interstate bridge to the Markam bridge.

To make the rush-hour commute as fast as possible. Get rid of the HOA lane on I5 N. Not only is it offensive to people in Vancouver, it makes the commute for people who live in North Portland miserable as well.

Use the money wisely and keep streets repaired before spending on more street cars or max lines.
We should consider the most traveled roads and not spend money on all roads. The most dangerous roads should be looked at as well.

Why don't we just undo what we just paid to do. We can put back the two lane streets to what they were. Take out the concrete corners (aka parking place taker, carbon intensive anti green idea). Then we should pave the streets. Does anyone really think that with a doubling population one lane streets are going to work? These "solutions are making me want to move. And I am seeing people increasingly choose to live over the river because of these "smart ideas."

You need a maybe button. I don't always support making roads wider. It depends on the specifics. Good repair is essential. Setting up neighborhood systems that don't require travel of any distance would be ideal.

But instead we are making streets narrower, putting in apartments without parking so that they have to park on already stressed neighborhood streets and making it difficult to even get to your own house. We sometimes have to pull over two blocks from a corner to deal with one-way traffic because the cars on both sides leave only enough room for one car and in some cases trying to turn onto a side street creates grid lock because there is no room. Cars then have to back up to try to fix the problem. Bad planning anyway you look at it.

But since this is part of the primary function of governments, I don't see why this would be a consideration for "NEW" things.

Don't drive, I'll leave that up to more qualified respondents.

Equity for areas of poverty.

It is poor policy to widen streets unless there is a compelling climate-friendly reason for it. Anything for encourages motor vehicle use takes us in the wrong direction.

Keep up adequate repairs. More lights at busy intersections. Keep line of sights clear of obstructions such as trees and bushes, more actively ticket trucks and cars that improperly park at a corner. Tinted windows on SUVs and trucks are becoming a very real problem for being able to see if traffic is coming when they are parked close or right at the corner.

Our roads and highways are in terrible shape. improving them benefits pedestrians, drivers, cyclists and those who take public transit. everyone needs this!

Slowly work toward paving the unimproved streets, starting with those that have houses fronting on them. If streets are paved, they are provided with safe lighting. My street is so dark it's too spooky for the trick or treaters.

Traffic is becoming more and more clogged during rush hours. Rush hours are getting longer.

When streets are widened, it takes longer for pedestrians to cross them. Street lights must allow time for aging pedestrians to cross.
Widening some roads on the east side making better access east and west to the frequent north and south running lines. There seems to be some unaccessible areas that a bus line could help local business.

Actually this is my least high priority. I do think that bridges need seismic upgrades, and sidewalks and crosswalks with flashers on busy streets are important. I would sacrifice road maintenance to infrastructure improvements.

Again, balance.

Again, I do support this but the system of providing these services needs to be equitable throughout the region.

Areas of high growth.

As improvements are made, improve bike safety at the same time.

As long as this isn't yet another attempt to get a vote for more bikeways.

Avoid the frequent changes in the widths (number of traffic lanes) of our major streets, as this only leads to more congestion at "bottle neck" points.

Bike / Walking Routes.

Bike lanes should be well connected and in many places streets should be widened. One example: Taylor's Ferry Road. This street needs bike lanes and sidewalks from Macadam to Jackson Middle School.

Biking and walking paths and sidewalks as part of this plan.

But I am not supporting a local tax for this either.

But make mass transit expenditures the priority. Consider usage tolls linked to hours of use for trucks to decrease congestion during peak commute hours on freeways and major thoroughfares. It wouldn't be difficult to install electronic readers to monitor truck usage and paid tolls/hours of use.

But only if it is done in a fiscally responsible manner. Do the basics first...pave all roads and provide sidewalks first. Multnomah Village had a decent paved road and sidewalks. The City of Portland redid it at great cost. The finished product is indeed nicer and some rain run off is no longer going into the sewer system. However, the change in parking design makes getting out of diagonal spaces less safe than previously, due to decreased visibility and putting all handicapped parking at one end of the village rather than at both ends in poor planning. The funds spent here could have been used to paved many streets and once they were all paved, then we could think of upgrades.

But very limited widening only if stormwater addressed for entire roadway.

Change left turn signals to blink yellow and allow left turns with caution. Washington county and/or Beaverton already do this and it helps move traffic safely and faster.

Concentrate on repair of roadways instead of widening.

Corridors where many more people would bike or walk or take transit if the options were safer, more reliable, better connected.
Cost and equity.

Emphasis should be placed on the efficiency of traffic flow.

Ensuring that businesses get what they need to be competitive in moving goods.

Expand 217 to 3 lanes, fix rose quarter bottleneck. Address that.

Focus on safe traffic flow in neighborhoods feeding arterials with higher speed limits.

Focus on widening highways. Upkeep roads, starting with most used.

Funds should be balanced and shared.

Goal should be to move cars and trucks though the region as quickly as possible.

Greater investment in SW and E Portland.

I’d like there to be a lot of consideration given to air pollution from vehicles.

Infrastructure repair should be the primary focus and needs significant attention. Secondarily existing policies that do not tend toward improvement of conditions (e.g. long-standing desire for no sidewalks in SW) should be reconsidered and/or changed to improve safety.

It is just as important to maintain and/or pave small neighborhood roads as it is to maintain large ones, you should see some of the roads in SW Portland. They’re less roads and more gravel duck ponds.

It should be balanced with real need. For example, last year the street in front of Reiki Elementary and Wilson High schools were re-paved - and I felt that was not needed at that time. At the time, the streets were fine!! I thought that was an example of resources flowing to areas where it is not needed and then short changing those areas with great needs.

Keep high volume traffic out of neighborhoods, make high crash corridors safer.

Look into the newer "self-repairing" asphalt materials to double road lifespan and reduce pot holes.

Maintain current infrastructure.

Maintaining roads should be put ahead of widening roads. Visible white stripes are important.

Maintaining what we have. Keeping up with paving. No need for new freeways.

Make sure that your strategy meets your stated goals and is not just a way to further support emphasis on transit and bicycles.

Making streets and highways safe for motor vehicles is a much lower priority than improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. There are always trade-offs when considering freight. Safety is important for all modes, but please prioritize safety for vulnerable road users over safety for motor vehicles.

Many of our streets might last longer and be safer for everyone if the speeds were reduced. I appreciate the creative road maintenance of filling cracks.

Most people already travel too fast, so don't design these streets only for cars. When cars go really fast, people don't want to walk or bike there (ex. Barbur Blvd.).
New development must have on-site parking for all units, taking parked cars off the street. Street repair/maintenance should be done in lower income areas first–these are the people with the fewest options. Consider a toll on all bridges excluding public transportation and multi passenger vehicles.

No, no targeted widening of streets and highways. First, look at the urban network and identify potential roads for creating shoulders that can be used for pedestrian and bike trips. Take time to educate the elected officials to field demands from citizens and businesses that insist on more lanes.

Options other than taxing small businesses! This is a cost that should be shared by everyone. Also put more pressure on our representative in Salem and D.C. to lobby harder for our share of the transportation funding.

Pay for it out of existing taxes..............no road tax. If there is a road tax, forget it.

Plans for widening of streets and particularly highways needs to be based on 5-10 year population growth projections rather than constantly playing 'catch up'.

Repair and maintain existing infrastructure in lieu of costly new.

Safety for non-motorized vehicles AND pedestrians, including, the partially or fully disabled.

Same comment. Compare investments in streets to the other options for limited transportation funds.

Separate bike lanes from traffic lanes. Increase PBOT's remote monitoring of traffic lights to keep traffic flowing more smoothly. Traffic backups and gridlock are a serious issue.

Should focus on repair and maintenance.

Smart investment to reduce congestion (on the other hand, more congestion will encourage more people to switch to biking and public transit). So not sure on this one.

Some of our neighborhood streets haven't been repaved or even had potholes repaired in decades. My own street looks as if it was last paved about 40 years ago!

SW needs repaving regardless of curbs & sidewalks on both sides. Policy to not improve because lack of room or bad road bed is a vile excuse. I broke my ankle walking to the bus stop. Now I drive. Everywhere. And WASTE my money by digging up SW Multnomah Blvd AGAIN! And FIX the last part of SW Capitol Hwy! Impermeable asphalt paving Impermeable walks, etc.

The effective flow of traffic including the timing of traffic signals to reduce idling time, air pollution.

The Portland Water Bureau seems to have a large surplus of funds. Maybe some of those funds found be used. OK, I know the answer. There is a need to fill the pot-holes and keep the roads in good repair-but I do not support more taxes to property owners or on individuals living in households. Find another way.

The tunnel coming into the city on Route 26 is very dangerous, people tend to go too fast and too close together. The merge (east bound) onto Route 405 is badly constructed. Additionally Route 205 in any direction should be avoided!

They should be safe, but not widened or street centered construction at the detriment to pedestrians and bicycles.
This is a very poorly written "triple-barrelled" question. I support highway safety, but we already spend a lot of money on that. I support reliable roads, but ditto. I definitely support better interconnections between existing roads and not enough funding goes to that. I DO NOT support widening of streets and highways -- studies show that it simply leads to more people using those roads.

This should be done _only_ if adding sidewalks and bike lanes is included.

We should maintain what we have, but prioritize the road connections that are most necessary.

When street improvement are made, bike and pedestrian improvements should be made as well.

Whether or not presently built neighborhoods and communities have "Complete Streets" and if they do not then prioritize the implementation of this policy to invest there first. A measurable baseline should be established by each jurisdiction such that we can begin to know if we are making progress in addressing the implementation of "Complete Streets", use of GIS tools could help greatly if keeping track of progress (e.g. linear miles of improvement made).

Widening of streets leads to speeding traffic.

With public input since it is our tax dollars that will pay for it. If a majority of people don't want something, don't use government elitism to shove it down their throats. It will come back to bite you. Invite business experts to show the city and county different/ better and more affordable ways to fix the street infrastructure issues if their solutions are thought to be the hardest most expensive way to handle it.

Yes, and the key is to WIDEN streets, not narrow them, as been the trend the last few years in every part of Portland. In my years here, I marvel at how completely inept Portland's traffic engineers are at building safe, well-thought out, navigable, visible and aesthetic roadways in an on-time and on-budget manner. The accompanying striping, reflectivity and signage is also laughably ineffective. I've seen multiple simple projects that should take a month stretch into three or more, while equipment sits idle at the side of the road. An overall inefficient, unproductive and costly system at work in this city, which clearly is in the dark about good, safe, effective road design.

Yes, I think infrastructure must be in good repair. I'm not so in favor of building more roads. More in favor of the Vancouver B.C. model of fewer roads and more transit.

Yes. Reducing traffic lights and the need for stop/go travel is a good advancement.

You spent so much on the bike that the roads are now dangerous please repair them.

Any new development meet good, safe design for connectivity with traffic patterns that prevent jams.

Base on frequency of use + impact to neighborhoods.

Better lighting, sidewalks, slower speeds, more and higher penalties for law breakers.

Business's need a well-connected system to do business efficiently.

But who is going to be taxed to make it happen? Will it be the developers who make the profit off new communities or the people in established neighborhoods not requiring new infrastructure?
Create exclusive pedestrian and bicycle pathways. I drive in downtown Portland less than five times a year because I hate dealing with people and cyclists crossing against traffic lights and serving in and out of traffic.

Existing infrastructure maintenance and upgrading are the key. Additional roadways are not the key as discouragement of motor-vehicle access is the goal. Improvements to existing freeways (including interstate bridges) are necessary as mass-transit is not a panacea to questions of transportation.

Great Caesar's Ghost. For heaven's sake, pave some of those unpaved streets in Portland residential areas, and provide sidewalks where they are missing.

Let's pave all the streets so that everyone can travel safely!

Make sure you have reliable/consistent signage and wayfinding tools. For example, make sure EVERY sign referencing a street gives the same name (i.e. don't call it "Chavez" on one and 39th on another). People who don't live here or who haven't lived here for very long, don't know/care what the street used to be called.

Repair our roads Yellow turn lights to lesson iding Do not chop up roads for bikes.

Since I pay taxes for this I expect it to happen.

The same issues as before, personal cost and taxation, however I do NOT support the personal fee associated with paving Portland's unimproved streets, even though renters and businesses will also have to pay this fee. I do not believe this issues is important enough that I can afford to pay more taxes on incomes that can barely and often don't support a mere survival for my household! I can just choose to not use these streets as my car is too old to handle those roads, that is a matter of choice.

There are some areas, especially north / northeast PDX, that have little to no finished roads and no sidewalks. Before improving existing ones, invest in areas that don't have pavement / sidewalks to begin with. These tend to be in lower-income areas.

Traffic patterns need to be considered. Let's not take away from busy streets or add to quiet ones however make them safe and easy to navigate.

Biking, walking and transit connections.

Cars stopped in traffic generate more emissions than those moving freely.

Circuitous routes to main roads should be streamlined.

Cost.

Fair taxation....I think VMT would be the fairest.

I'd do the previous two action items first before this one.

Maintain existing infrastructure before building new. I love all the planters but NOT maintained (sylvan overpass an example).

Must be cost effective. Keep it functional in nature. Focus must be on effectiveness and money shouldn't be spent on unnecessary esthetics.
Only if it makes common sense and lots of add-ons such as more bike lanes, sidewalks which add to costs are NOT tacked on. Just expand the roads to keep traffic moving. I support bike lanes, and pedestrian routes...but there are SO many now, that the cars have to dodge around islands, move over to center areas or are confined to one lane because the space was used for the bikeways or sidewalk. Case in point, SW Vermont ST and Idaho DR in Portland...where a 3 way intersection goes into a smaller pocket neighborhood and due to the slope on Vermont cars just naturally slow down before they reach that point. After 40+ years in that neighborhood don’t ever recall an accident or pedestrian hit in that section, nor have my children ever had an issue then or now crossing over to the park or bus or biking/running to downtown via Vermont. So, just completed was not one but 2 crosswalks added in that spot + 2 islands yet there is a crosswalk at 45th/Vermont about 250’ away. If one was absolutely necessary in order to "spend" money, it should have been located at SW 36th/Vermont at top of Gabriel Park. (that is mid-hill and would have made more "sense"). Now the car parking next to the park is a mess and very tight for them, one car in motion, and one bike. Plus there are 4 really ugly tall signs on the islands that are distracting to drivers from all.

Prioritize spending on most used streets and highways; emphasize north-south connectors.

Yes, we do need to maintain the existing infrastructure. However, expansion of motor vehicle lanes should be considered only after very careful analysis, since adding lanes typically induces more traffic and not produce benefits commensurate with the costs, including loss of land and damage to public health and neighborhoods.

You're asking too many questions with this one question. I support making streets safe - especially for pedestrians and cyclists. No more capacity projects. They simply resolve a problem in one location leading to increased congestion elsewhere. Roadways are generally very safe for motorists, unless they’re drunk, texting, or speeding. The safety issues to be addressed are for folks not using a car.

Balance routes most commonly used while maintaining neighborhood access.

Do not widen anymore roads. You cannot solve congestion issues by widening roads (see all of the latest research).

Fix those potholes and congestion-filled thoroughfares. Retime those lights!

Improve current roads, not expand more roads.

Major changes are on the way and climate change is going to require significant levels of adaption - what do you intend to do to facilitate it?

Maximize efficiency and cost vs. benefits.

Minimize wining of streets as this can sometimes cause increases in automobile traffic.

No expansion of freeway system.

Only for areas of high danger and accident history. Roads need to be maintained. Bikes should be redirected to a nearby neighborhood street to maintain safety from highly traveled streets like Hawthorne, Division, etc.

Opportunities for multi-modal improvements benefitting motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit.
Reducing commute times.

Spend your money on streets and roads that people use, not on economically unsustainable projects.

These improvements need to be comprehensive, with sidewalks for walkers and bike lanes part of any road improvement plan.

Widen the roads! Anticipate growth!

Connectivity is important. If we have major highways without a good connective network in between, then commuters, freight and services have to take longer trips, which creates more traffic, pollution and irritation. Work on the connectivity portion.

Current traffic loads on neighborhood streets, and how to keep through traffic on the major arterials instead of filtering through side streets that are not built for arterial-type traffic.

Do not widen roads. Keep roads in good condition and limit car traffic in the central city by using technology.

Don't over-manage. Too much of our transportation funds are wasted on unnecessary layers of management. Streamline operations, and use outside contractors when they can do a better job.

Eliminate traffic signals and stops at intersections. Replace every single one with a roundabout. The roundabouts that have been implemented around here are far too large. Look at Aruba's roundabouts for how to do them in the same space as a normal intersection. Most of Aruba's intersections with traffic control are roundabouts, and they just don't have the ridiculous wait times that we do. Those waits are caused by traffic signals.

Focus resources on improving and maintaining streets that impacts the greatest user base.

Getting the most bang for our tax dollars. Again, fiscal responsible planning and execution. Washington County is a leader in this area.

How to reduce future costs. Regular low level road repairs cost less than occasional major road projects - keep up on road repairs.

I heartily agree with this policy. More emphasis on streets and highways, a lot less on mass transit.

I support maintenance of roadways. I only support additional roadway development if bike ways and pedestrian connectivity are the primary drivers for the projects.

I support traffic calming measures and road repair, but not the building of more roads. And please, please do something about enforcement of speed limits in residential neighborhoods.

In this order: needs of community, cost of construction, disruption of traffic.

Investing in maintaining existing infrastructure may be a necessary trade-off to expanding infrastructure for widening projects that promote more SVO trips.

Long term planning for street improvement. The City of Tigard and City of Portland as well have demonstrated how not to plan for the long term with regards to street improvement.

More road bumps in residential areas that are used to avoid traffic on main roads.
More routes into Portland from the westside! We have overpopulated west of Portland without improving highway infrastructure so now we have to deal with major congestion and its only going to get worse as population continues booming all the way out to Forest Grove.

My answer is somewhat. Safe, reliable, and connected are important as long as it doesn't lead to paving over much more land. Ways should be worked out to make them as environmentally friendly as possible, as well as people friendly.

Prohibit formerly fashionable road hindrances such as "pregnant curbs" and anything else designed to slow down traffic. The way to cut emissions is to SPEED UP traffic, which eliminates idling at inefficient RPMs. So add nose control as necessary, but stop pretending the car or truck is the enemy! Make WIDE roads, more lanes, not fewer. Priority to cars and trucks not bikes.

Quit taking lanes away from cars and giving it to bikes.

Repair / condition of roads is primary. As for new road building and widening - no matter how many new roads are built and widened, congestion doesn't appear to decrease. Perhaps monies can best be spent on public transportation and alternative transportation methods. Roads continue to be packed no matter what we do.

Safety: All highways and streets should continue to be repaved and maintained on a regular basis. Areas that are high traffic and one lane, such as in Portland Metro suburbs need to be expanded to absorb the higher traffic and minimize fender benders/accidents.

Streets and highways are pretty good, only invest to fix problems.

Streets HAVE TO BE MAINTAINED!

This needs to be priority 1.

This should be #1, #2 and #3. Even despite billions in spending on light rail, streetcars, commuter rail, and biking and walking paths - Portlanders remain committed to the car, with over 80% driving. Even recent studies disprove the myth that people are fleeing their cars and choosing a car-free lifestyle. So we need to get with the reality that people are going to drive - and investments can be made to make sure that our roadway network is efficient to avoid air pollution impacts caused by congestion.

This should really be a no-brainer, but sadly in our region we seem to ignore that 80% of us drive. Even with the billions spent on light rail, we still drive. This is job #1 for Metro. We need to stop looking at light rail. Building light rail has not solved any problems; and in fact has many some problems worse or created new problems. It's time to look at our underinvested highway system. And we do need to look at the "e" word - EXPAND.

We are a society that uses cars as a major mode of transportation...like it or not, that's the way it is and most taxpayers wish it to remain this way.

We have to MAINTAIN what we have and improve when needed.
We need a westside loop from Hillsboro to Wilsonville to take the pressure off of Hwy 26/217/I-5. No good comes from making 217 a parking lot with thousands of auto engines idling.

We need maintenance to preserve our investment in streets, but streets and highways should not be our highest priority.

Would like to see the breakdown of the transportation taxes I pay (fuel taxes, car registration, etc) and the percentage of those funds that actually goes to pay for roads that cars use.

Yes, more lanes and more roads is good for business and people who work and value their time. Stop using tax payer money on light rail, when high speed busses and more roads have proven to be a more cost efficient way of moving people.

"Targeted widening of streets" greatly decreases quality of life for the communities surrounding said street.

Cost per user mile to include all passengers in the vehicle and transit vehicles that use the road system, including all infrastructure and support systems to make the roadway possible. I firmly believe if we had a westside bypass like I 205, it would have immediate and lasting economic impact and use that would benefit Washington County greatly.

Funds should be used to repair and maintain existing roadways instead of boondoggle light rail projects that communities do not want.

Implement AFTER completing the rapid transit system.

More lighting. There are really cost-efficient ways to light streets.

People want transportation freedom. Improved streets, wider streets, etc. will give people the choices they want.

Providing some redundancy in the system so that traffic doesn't grind to a halt every time there is an accident. Connect neighborhoods so that everyone isn't dumped onto the same roads all the time. Give drivers options. Keep traffic moving quickly to increase efficiency and decrease pollution.

Quit pretending that we can keep adding population without expanding or even repairing our streets and highways. Get real. We need bigger and better funding sources for highway improvement and we need to be smarter about spending the money we do have.

Reducing traffic by providing more and better roads.

The need for by-passes to relieve congestion is widely recognized but little action. In the meantime access to affordable right of ways diminishes.

The new bridge downtown should allow cars...expand 217 and 26 and I5. Build i5-99w connector, westside bypass and stop loot rail.

We need more connected highways and freeways. We also need 217 to be widened to four lanes in each direction. This is a must, not an option. We need substantial money invested in our road system.
We need more investment to keep traffic moving. Congestion causes safety problems. We should not congest our way to alternative mode use. Address key bottlenecks like Hwy 217.

We need roads that circumvent Portland. Forcing through traffic on I-5 is a fool's errand. We need a westside bypass that goes from south of Wilsonville north between Hillsboro and Forest Grove and on up to join I-5 north of Vancouver. This will relieve the pressure on Portland and help spur growth in Washington County.

We need the Westside By-Pass, Interstate 5-Highway 99W connector, Highway 217 widened, Highway 26 widened and Interstate 5 widened...The CRC is a complete boondoggle.

We need west side bypass and I5-99w connector and 217 widened.

When upgrading streets and highways, also upgrade stormwater management using green infrastructure like bioswales and street trees.

Yes, the road layout in Portland metro area has to be one of the worst designed systems I've seen. Get a highway system to parallel 99 (Pacific Hwy) and complete the I-205 loop around the city.

90% of us use cars every day. By adding lanes, making it easier for traffic to get through Portland the vast majority of the population benefits rather than the 10% minority of residents living primarily in North, Northeast, and Southeast Portland who use subsidized public transportation, walking, or biking.

Better maintained roads. increased traffic flow on main streets.

Continual upkeep of roads is cheaper than alot of upkeep/repair every 5-7 years.

Don't allow large developments to have only one access road. Be sure to keep neighborhoods livable, with street plantings of trees and shrubs and sidewalks.

I agree with needing to keep roads in good repair but not investing to expand the system. I'd like to see more investments in expanding alternate transportation options.

I am amazed that after sooo many years, we finally have flashing yellow turn lights. This was a no brainer that I called WA Co about so many times and was always told for years that "we can't do that on Walker Rd". Perhaps there are other ideas such as this that would be simple and help move folks. I wish I could come up with one right now but cannot Moving traffic is going to be hard and I am in favor of taxing folks like me that use the roads more than everyone else. I am afraid that how to implement this policy will take someone with more insight than I have.

I favor maintaining what we have and keeping it reliable and connected, minimize new road construction in favor of public transportation.

I only support this; making streets and highways safe which I assume includes paving, a more coordinated effort. Please don't pave just prior to a sewer, water or other utility dig. Why pave a street then only to have it dug up within a few weeks or months. We need better long range planning between all involved.

I support maintaining what we have, for sure. but i oppose adding lanes -- our roads will ALWAYS be at capacity during rush hours. make it easier and more appealing to leave the car at home.
I think the "connected" part is most important. I live 0.5 miles from a MAX station. But, I have to walk 1 mile to get there because there is no direct path.

Just not more/bigger roads. And when possible minimizing repairs to the minimum. We do a lot of repaving--is it necessary?

My first priority is public transportation, bicycling and pedestrian. That would come prior to the tie-ins to regional transportation needs.

North south connectivity seems be a general problem.

Pave the unpaved roads first!

Potholes and ragged roads are dangerous for everyone, bikers, pedestrians and cars. Street maintenance should be a main priority for the transportation budget. Adding bike lanes when you're already repaving a street is fine and dandy, but focus more of our resources on maintaining what we already have. Also, widen Hawthorne and Division streets or change to three lanes. I'm tired of almost getting hit by the bus when I'm in the lane next to it.

Something to consider is LED lighting. LED lights have been installed in our Cedar Hills neighborhood and the lighting improvement is huge.

Streets are definitely falling apart in a lot of places, and that should be a priority. I would also appreciate alternative routes to busy locations to ease traffic congestion. I am concerned, however, about how widening the streets and adding more access to already congested roadways would improve traffic without running into more problems that would justify the costs to implement the policy.

Tax trucks and studded tires.

The roads in the Portland metro area are an absolute joke. The signs for the Portland Pothole line are stupid. Any person who ever drove the roads would say what a waste of money on signs when the roads are completely full of potholes and trashed. Trimet should be sued for the degraceful way they have not maintained the road around the rail lines, expecially in downtown Portland where the intersections of MAX and Streetcar meet. You can only drive about 5 miles per hour through these intersections the gaps are so gapping! And even then you feel like you and your car have been assaulted.

There is a risk in making auto travel more efficient--it discourages alternatives.

This needs to be high priority. Connectivity can reduce congestion.

Transit doesn't go where I need it to go and certainly couldn't make it there in a timely manner. Cars get us where we need to go.

Triage the needs. Don't overlook poor neighborhoods.

Use the gas task that was put into the general fund years ago.
Walker Road between Murray and 170th is being improved - the signs went up recently. But, it's west of 170th where the bike lane goes to nothing. They just paved it, but didn't spend a few more dollars to get a wide-enough bike lane, just a few inches to side of fog line.

We need to maintain the infrastructure we have - too many road need repairs and are being neglected - Need to see which intersections have higher incidents of traffic accidents and analyze the information to work to reduce the cause of these.

Where is the majority of the traffic headed at any given time and can the roads accommodate it.

Why it took so long to get flashing yellow turn signals is a mystery to me. I am sure there are other policies that would help traffic flow if we would think outside the box. Really, does one have to wait minutes when there is no traffic to turn onto 217 south from Walker Rd? That has been the way for 30 years till recently and calls about it were shrugged off as from some nutball.

Yes, but do this with concern for the flora and fauna and make the speed limits reasonable. I think 45 MPH down a stretch of Murray is much too fast. People drive over that limit anyway. Slow people down with traffic patterns (roundabouts are fine by me). Treed boulevards are the best. I lived in Kansas City MO for years and loved their boulevards with trees, fountains and art.

Yes, so long as lanes are NOT added to freeways.

Highways could be made safer and better connected by lowering traffic speeds to 45, 35 during the day, and rebuilding many off- and on-ramps to slow people more and have them meet the city streets perpendicularly- no more ramps and slip lanes that encourage speeding and create hazards for pedestrians.

Slowing highway speeds through our cities. Resist freeway widening projects that, through induced demand, will create larger traffic jams in the heart of the city and decrease air quality. Work towards evolving the interstates into more arterial-like streets through the city to slow drivers and change expectations of speed.

A potential ring road was a missed opportunity for which we will be paying dearly for the foreseeable future - remember when you are making future plans that the population is exploding EXPONENTIALLY and don't just keep adding the past increase to the future projects because it will ALWAYS be much, much greater

Add lanes to all roads.

All users-- cars, pedestrians, bikes-- not just traffic. Also, ensuring better traffic flow for cars would go a long ways towards making existing infrastructure more efficient and usable. For example, traffic light patterns seem to have nothing to do with traffic patterns and tend to increase bottlenecks on arterial streets (Cornell, Cedar Hills Blvd, Barnes, for example) and push cars onto residential streets as an alternative.

Arterials should not have so many lanes as to be unwieldy. Feeders and local streets need to have traffic calming so as to support the use of arterials and highways.

But let's not waste the money we have on other, less necessary projects. I think the city is very poor in handling money.
Car and truck easy and efficient movement is a priority.

Citizens should have a voice in decisions about expansion of the road network, and about widening of roads and streets in their neighborhoods. Developers should not have the first or final say.

Congested streets may be the biggest challenge to getting around town safely and reliably. Traffic jams negatively affects the cleanliness of our environment too. Widen roads and improve others is the most effective, affordable and expeditious way to solve this problem.

Consider population growth in the next 50 years.

develop a legal environment that requires a greater emphasis for taking responsibility for one's own actions and decisions.

Funding must not be regressive.

I would like to see priority given to mass transit and BIGGER PARKING AREAS or MULTI-LEVEL GARAGES as well as lots more SECURE bike parking at Max stops before many more roads are just widened to accommodate more cars.

In making these improvements are we doing things that will increase driving? Are we doing things that may increase urban sprawl? What will be the impact on existing communities?

It is important to have streets that connect to one another. When I lived in Arlington, VA and worked at the Pentagon, I had about six different routes to my house, so if traffic was bad on one route, I could take another. I do think it is important that commuters take residential streets at a safe speed (generally lower than 25 mph).

Keep investment balanced.

Long-term planning for easier, safer connections to new devt.

Maintain what we have rather than building new.

Mileage taxes.

Most important as this will continue to be the major method of transportation. It will be more green as hybrids take hold for commuting.

Must continually re-invest in infrastructure.

New developments need to cover the additional burden to traffic flow created by the new families or employees that are attracted.

Of course! Who would not support such a broadly-worded question? But priority should be given to mass transit, bicycles, etc.

Our economy depends on good roads.

Prioritize pedestrian and bicycle improvements over simply widening streets - incorporate both types of improvement at the same time.
Prioritize spending to achieve this goal. We don't need more taxes from existing payers. Eliminate wasteful spending such as the canola subsidy and PDC overheads to repair the streets.

Repairs first.

Road infrastructure is pretty poorly maintained. Safe/reliable/connected is all interwoven.

Stop wasting road taxes for bike lanes, etc.

Streets need to be maintained, highways could be made safer with more signage, patrolling, and maintenance.

The investment made should be done and an explanation of how time and individual costs are saved by having good streets (wear and tear on vehicles, and reducing time of travel by reducing congestion).

This is a no brainer.

This is why the gas tax was initiated anyway. Use that money for it's intended purpose and not the dozen other projects that ODOT has been required to fund not associated with roads or road safety.

This should be the highest transportation priority. Period.

Traffic needs to move. Too much money has been wasted on alternative forms of transportation. It's time to spend time on roads, build new roads, to get traffic moving.

Use technology to minimize standstills and gridlock, saving both fuel and time.

We should prioritize route availability for moving freight from the regions major employers such as Intel. Simply building lots more roads will not solve the problem (e.g. Los Angeles). Perhaps rail is an alternative for moving raw materials and finished goods. Important to keep these materials moving to support business while giving commuters better options.

Why do I have to drive 4 to 6 blocks to turn left downtown?? Don't make it difficult to go where I need to go. It just increases traffic and fuel use.

Widen arterial streets from two to four lanes or more if possible. Forget bikes on these streets. They do not belong there other than crossing at traffic signals.
Yes, an excellent idea. There are two parts to it: road transit for commerce, and road transit for the public. Their requirements overlap, but not completely. For commerce, there needs to be improved traffic flow along the I-5 corridor. Portland is a very isolated place; it is difficult to ship product directly from here to the Pacific; the eastbound highways get slow or blocked in the winter; so we need to be able to get product to California and to Seattle. Better bridge access across the Columbia would help. Of course, not holding the bridge hostage to light transit and bicycle lanes, thinking through the problem of bridge height above river for shipping traffic, etc., should be done well. Most of the rest of the country can manage to do this, so maybe we could bring in outside experts to do it for Portland next time. For commercial traffic, places like NW Portland could benefit from large parking garages so that people with cars can actually visit and shop in, say, NW 23rd. I'm sure there are other places for which this applies. I give you the example of NYC, where people from New Jersey drive through the Lincoln Tunnel, park in public garages just on the Manhattan side, and spend the rest of the day walking. It works! Even if not invented in Portland, it still works.

Yes, safe arterial roads; try to divert traffic off of side streets and bike though ways.

Be careful to do preventive maintenance.

Don't let what happened to SE division happen in other areas. there are way too many apartment/condos without sufficient parking. streets are always full and I dread when all the buildings are completed.

Efficiency, population and cost.

Fair and impartial allocation of available funds.

Find where the congestion is and find a solution.

First priority for areas where public transportation is not frequent or convenient. Bad roads are very painful for many seniors who have bad backs or other parts of the body and are jarred with pot holes and ridges.

Good signage, appropriate speed limits, smart on ramp signals.

I do not support the blanket street fees being bandied about. I believe that users should pay for the use of the resources that they are using. The gas tax is an example. There should be a bike licensing and usage fee. Road maintenance fee should be based on miles driven and not a flat rate or based on income or property value.

Keeping up maintenance is crucial

More lanes for passenger vehicle and trucks is what will help Portland, more light rail and street cars is the most expensive and least productive path forward. It makes us feel good, but that is the only benefit.

Should not be eliminating lanes on the streets unless more congestion is a desired result.

The gas taxes should be spent on roads for vehicles that pay the gas taxes. If you want to come up with a tax of some sort for the battery cars, that is ok, but gas taxes should be used for car and truck traffic, not bike lanes.

There should be multiple ways (streets) to travel to the same place--not just one main road.

This one is a no-brainer, especially where public transportation is not frequent or convenient.
THIS SHOULD BE OUR #1 PRIORITY!!! The need for this should greatly outpace any other in this survey. If allocating from 100%, I would place 60% in this bucket.

This should be the lowest priority on this list, as we should be focusing time, energy, and resources on alternate methods of transportation.

"Safe" should not be "more"-- improved connections are fine to reduce traffic impacts, but not adding lanes-- the lanes simply become clogged with more cars.

But only when pedestrians are given their share.

Equal rights for pedestrians. we need safe reliable and connected rows too.

Generally speaking yes, however, I am skeptical about increasing the amount of roads and highways we have, as it will make things easier to use a car, which is not environmentally sustainable (especially if Portland is indeed adding the 750K additional inhabitants in the next 10 years) as we want to curb GHG emissions. Although I could be wrong in the assumption that if car trips are inconvenient and prone with congestion people will switch to other alternatives of transport, telecommute, move, etc.

I dunna' know about "connected", did you mean connectivity?

I support maintenance more than creating new car oriented networks.

Investing where there is a clear payoff. I believe that roads should take a backseat to transit, biking, and walking improvements (pun intended).

Just trying to make existing roads smoother is a multi decade daunting task-& let’s not even talk about our benighted a& N.E. Neighbors who pay prop. taxes & have unpaved streets & entirely unmaintained alleyways. Shame on us!

Keeping the road system in good repair to help make travel more efficient: YES building a well-connected network of streets that support all users: YES the targeted widening of streets and highways to support travel across the region: NO Streets should be safe to use, but should be focused on freight and pushing individual travel out of single occupancy cars.

Making it easier for cars to get around should not be a top priority. However, keeping existing roads in good/safe condition is important.

Making sure all neighborhoods are treated equally.

Many close-in neighborhood streets are not wide enough for oncoming cars when cars are parked on both sides. This is a challenge for pedestrians and bikes as well as traffic flow. Selective limitations on parking should be used to ease congestion.

Of course streets and highways should be safe, reliable and connected, but not so much that speed is a priority. Leave speed to public transportation, dedicated bus lanes, express buses, etc.

Reduce congestion! Stop building so many large housing projects. Too much traffic every one drives is stressful.
Start with areas that don't have paved streets like East Multnomah County. No more highways.

Streets and highways should be efficient ways to travel further than it is reasonable to ride a bike.

There should be a toll on the Columbia bridge that helps pay for increase buses to and from Vancouver as well as the upkeep.

This is the most important.

When streets are well paved, lights well timed with good directionnal signage, it is safer for all users.

Where heavy traffic will not be negatively impacted by the changes.

I see an increasing need for our freeways to accommodate more commuters. I have heard that stop and go traffic can produce more carbon emissions than traffic that has a smooth flow. I live in Outter SE Portland and now I work in Beaverton and Lake Oswego so being able to travel from place to place is important. I'd like to know if Portland has plans to add upper decks to our freeways since we have the geographical limitations of getting into and out of Portland itself. I could see something like that working well on 217 as well. Portland is enjoying a lot of popularity right now and lots of people are moving here, but the city's livability is going to suffer greatly if we can't commute in a reasonably efficient way.

Not as high a priority for me as #1 and #2. We need to shift from car use to public transit, bikes, and walking.

On ramps to freeways revamped to avoid traffic backups because of so many on ramps ie I5 Southbound & I405 with at least to surface street onramps in just feet.

Yes! But not at the expense of people on fixed incomes. We do not want a sales tax, we do not want a new tax. Generate income by enforcing the existing laws.

It seems like this should be completely paid for with gas taxes.

The lack of good streets in the city of Portland in particular SE Portland.

The most inefficient way to drive from an economical and ecological reality is slow and in grid lock. We need more lanes on all freeways, we need more freeways for interstate transit, moving of goods and people.

The narrowing of high traffic roads lately have caused more traffic jams around Burnside and SE 39th and N Williams without good communication to the public about alternate routes. Large amounts and varied levels of communication should be a major part of any plan.

Too many traffic congestion issues causing more pollution.

Yes, but I still don't know what this means. All the work being done on streets in SE have not helped the traffic situation but made it worse.

Build them to last in the first place--(do much better in the Midwest than here) so don't have to spend so much and disrupt traffic as much.
Concentrate on safety and connections. Repave streets, fill pot holes, REPAINT the lines that we should all be able to see on the streets. Implement the South Portland Circulation Study to fix multiple traffic problems in south Portland. Put more effort into close in neighborhoods and less into places like Hillsdale and outlying areas. Require all new construction to create sidewalks and connect them as far as they need to go to meet existing sidewalks.

Don't build more freeways.

Don't widen streets.

Existing roads should be maintained. I don't see the need for additional roads if we're also investing in ways to reduce the need for cars/commuting by car.

Highest priority should be to streets that play multi-modal roles in the system.

How can you not support any of these issues. The issues to broad for a yes/no response.

Infrastructure is an important priority in providing the underlying movement of goods, people and technology that underpin all commerce and human endeavor and facilitate growing a healthy economy. That said, building more linear highways and especially wide highways only promotes linear growth. Instead, prioritize repair and well-connected neighborhoods, minimize street widening to what is needed for moving goods, give as many alternatives as possible for local travel. Note that all infrastructure projects should be funded for maintenance as well as for construction - this makes the true costs apparent.

It's a neighborhood, community, and regional imperative that our streets, highways, and bicycle networks be well maintained, safely illuminated and coordinated as a systematic whole. Since we're not building more freeways and growing inward (rather than sprawl) communities need to work together to achieve a micro/macro approach.

Making roads safe doesn't necessarily mean making them wider.

Only use funds to maintain existing infrastructure. Avoid building new highways.

Plan in ways that allow new road construction to be kept to a minimum; explicitly include greenhouse gases in "pollution" (I'm repeating myself here . . .).

Priority should be given to commercial transportation with bus and rail encouraged for personal transportation.

Projected growth!

Prudent maintenance long-term budgeting reflecting expected lifetimes and future replacement needs practical alternatives.

Refrain from needlessly building more roads or widening roads only to encourage more traffic.

Stop investing in transit, bicycle and sidewalk projects.

Taking care of what we have now should be a higher priority than expanding.
The focus and funding should first be on transit, biking and easier walkability. Then local streets and routes. Last on highways because these get federal funding, have created a car-centric reality and do more to serve passers-through than residents.

Widening roads and putting in sidewalks is critical but not at the expense of our historic architecture.

Cost vs benefit.

Funding, citizen priority, technological advances.

Maintaining current infrastructure but directing new capital projects to options that are more equitable and climate smart.

That other forms of transit than the private car are accommodated.

The more one-way streets, the more confusion. Stop tossing one-way streets into the middle of two-way street systems. The more interruptions of numbered streets, the more confusion. If streets are numbered in order, that makes sense. Don't interrupt that system with streets that have names instead of numbers (especially when that causes numbers to be skipped). If you want wider streets, stop granting variances to builders and restaurants to encroach upon streets and sidewalks (especially in industrial areas). You can get wider streets by requiring off-street parking for all businesses and residential complexes.

We need to get out of the cycle of pushing maintenance off to future budgets and future generations.

Why the heck were Division and Burnside reduced to single lanes in each direction? The traffic during rush hour is maddening!

Again mature trees should be saved at all costs.

Availability of reliable sources of funding (these improvements are quite expensive).

Do not overbuild street systems.

Do something about the Abernethy Bridge. The bottleneck there is crazy & depletes resources, time, and productivity.

Emphasis on maintaining our present system.

Finish lighting all of McLoughlin Blvd. in the unincorporated area between Gladstone & Milwaukie. At night, especially when it's raining, it's impossible for drivers to see pedestrians crossing in mid-block.

Focus on maintenance of existing roads over expansion. Include bike and pedestrian access on underfunctioning roads. Always plan for transit access!

If you add roads, do it in ways that relive high congestion areas, such as the intersection of 82 & Highway 212/224.

Increase the fuel tax as it is a small percentage of fuel costs. I feel the majority has been overlooked because of special interest groups involvement. Projects and money have been mismanaged.

Keep considering the idea of toll roads.

Pave all streets first! Put in sidewalks! This is basic stuff. Then do the bike paths, etc.
Portland METRO is becoming gridlocked and it's detrimental to livability - it's extremely difficult to drive across and/or get out of town to enjoy this amazing state.......it needs to be fixed. The longer we wait the harder and more expensive it will be to fix.

Provide sidewalks and crossing signs and blinking lights.

The 205 area around the Abernathy bridge is a ridiculous bottleneck.

We cannot build ourselves out of failing levels of service. As a result, aesthetics should trump.

We should not be widening many, if any roads. We should keep them safe and in good repair and improve the network of options for all users. This should NOT be about adding more lane miles except in rare cases for safety that will not induce more demand. We need to be more resourceful with the lane miles we have.

Well engineered, safe, and maintained streets are an important and legitimate function of government.

Maintenance and upkeep of the infrastructure we have. Let's make it nice. Keep traffic moving. Minimizing stops. I think a big part of this needs to be on driver education - how to merge properly, don't follow too close, etc.

Do not impose a tax on me when you have managers in city government who do little work and you complain you need more investment money from me. Portland is becoming unaffordable.

We have more than enough streets. Traffic management techniques and technology should be used to get the most out of existing streets, for example, timed traffic signals, left turn lanes, etc.

Needs to be a holistic strategy to provide a useable transportation system including the road system while encouraging people to use alternative means of transportation to keep car use at a minimum.

Maintaining existing infrastructure should be top priority - if we can't even keep what we have maintained, how can we possibly afford more? Long term maintenance needs to be factored in when new projects are proposed. If we need it, we need to pay for it, if we don't want to pay for it, do we really need it? If it's questionable, build in a sunset plan.

More efficiency in work teams; reduced cost of overhead (1 supervisor per 1 - 3 workers is what appears to be the current norm in on-road teams; could be 1 per 10 or more). Continue to be most efficient with scheduling work teams on the roads during lowest traffic and best weather. Increase productivity metric outcomes.

Dedicated freight lanes, ideally on the far left with separate ramps. Trucks bring far more utility than HOVs or alt fuel vehicles per mile of pavement. Also only these lanes would need to be built to truck loads, allowing other lanes to carry personal vehicle loads. Movement of goods should pre-empt SOVs.

I'd support mass transit over road widening.

But don't forget the other ways to travel (train, light rail, walk and bikes). Roundabout roundabout roundabout! Can't say enough about them......use them everywhere!

Cost to lower middle and lower income families.

Structured financial plan to accommodate the full life cycle of a project from planning to decommissioning.
I support this within reason. Start by organizing utility construction that will breach the roadway. It doesn't make sense to tear up and patch sections of a road for different utilities over the course of a year. Permits could be focused so all of them work around the same window then cooperate to close a single patch.

Deal with I-5. It's a complete mess in both directions, North and South of Portland. Fix the I-5 bridge issues. The commute into Portland from all directions is really a disaster.

Increase gas taxes; use transponders to implement freeway use charges, with highest rates for short-distance users, and declining thereafter, depending on distance travelled on limited access roadways.

Many motorists do not comprehend the connection between speed and risk of injury. They don't know how fast things can go wrong. If more motorists could safely experience a crash, or loss of control, they would likely become more cautious drivers. Also, State requirements to know the traffic laws, via periodic licensing re-tests, needs to be significantly improved. Testing needs to happen every 4 years, for life. Consider how many laws change in a 4-year time period. The climate report focuses on technology in regards to network efficiency. This is unfortunate. The safety plan (2012) only mentions roundabouts twice, and not in the main body of the document. Modern roundabouts have the ability to not only reduce injury and fatal crashes, and make intersections safer for pedestrians and cyclists, but the efficiency gains from reduced delay, compared to signals, translates into significant point source pollution reduction. Modern roundabouts are not even mentioned in the climate change strategy or toolbox.

I-5 bridge - need I say more?

CRIME!!!

Our roadways have been neglected for too long. When bike lanes are added and driving lanes are taken away and not improved money isn't being spent where it moves the most people.

Again traffic volume should dictate investment schedules!

Gas tax is the main funding for this and should be dedicated to this area. Areas that have consistent congestion, should be made wider or other improvements to lower congestion.

Absolutely essential. New modes of personal electric transportation will virtually eliminate the need for mass transit.

Again, a goal that is desirable and sensible. The trick is the word "investment". Where are all of the funds going to come from to make these changes? Taxes? Fees? I don't necessarily support widening of streets and highways because of the "if you build it, they will come" phenomenon. Making driving less desirable than using transit, biking, or walking is the goal.

Be sure to promote the specific projects that make streets and highways safe, reliable and connected so that those who believe too much is spent on the bikeways and sidewalks understand that car & bus travel is not being ignored.

But care needs to be taken to not make already busy intersections busier.
Clackamas County. You treat Clackamas County like a red headed stepchild. I have exactly two roads I can use to get to work (15 miles) and one of them is 2-lane, the other is frequently overloaded. This is a commute entirely within the county and is not served by mass transit because of missing links. I can only get there using mass transit by a 2.5 hour (each way) ride through downtown Portland and downtown Beaverton!

Coordinate work so you don't have to undo what just done.

Cost.

Cost. Again- we have spent so much on light rail that the busses are too slow, the roads are crumbling.

Do not CRC us again. Metro, we are counting on YOU to hold the line against investments that prioritize single occupancy vehicles.

Don't overbuild, focus on safety.

Equity first. Underserved communities need the most help in making their streets safe (ie friendly to all users, not just motorists). Emphasize prevention and cheaper frequent maintenance over more costly though less frequent intense maintenance. Place the costs for street repair on those that damage streets the most - cars & trucks. Parking lots & garages should not be exempt business to any street taxes!

Explore new non-public options for funding... figure out what is damaging existing road systems and work on making changes that enhance the life of the existing systems.

Find a way to get maintenance dollars invested as easily as construction dollars.

I am especially concerned about seismic safety/bridges.

I think that keeping the road system in good repair and widening streets and highways is very important.

Improved maintenance on roads. Don't squeeze a bike lane in somewhere where it puts bicyclist at risk. The bump outs throw you into traffic when it might not be safe.

Keep roads in good repair. Oppose widening of Portland streets & highways. Highways need to be an adequate width to begin with. They are not the same as freeways.

Keep roads in good repair. Use gas taxes only for road maintenance and construction.

Keep the roads in good repair, keep the markings sharp and visible.

Maintain what we have first. Too many streets are potholed, or not paved.

Make good on long-developed plans for far SE Portland. Stop pretending that Pearl District residents are the only ones who matter.

More sidewalks, upkeep of unadopted roads particularly in town centers.

My previous comments have addressed some of these topics. Any road widening should happen where there is evidence that doing so would improve the traffic flow. The focus should be on severe areas of poor network connectivity such as the Ross Island Bridge / Naito Parkway area.

Not sure.
Our community is made up of car drivers. It is time to recognize this and support it through good roads and traffic flow.

Primary focus of funding should be on maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Projects that increase interconnectedness, to avoid funneling traffic onto congested arteries, should be prioritized. Projects that encourage carpooling should also be prioritized. We should also be encouraging narrower lanes to discourage speeding and the accidents and threats to pedestrians that entails. Road pricing should accompany widening - drivers should help pay for alleviating the congestion they cause. Road widening projects that encourage driving and driving at high speeds should be avoided.

Public consultation.

Recent studies (MIT tech blog) show that, for the most part, adding to road/freeway capacity only leads to increased traffic. Let's learn from other cities and cutting-edge science and engineering. We need to invest in community "hub" development IN THE OUTER REGIONS to give people more places to walk TO, and less reason to drive.

Reduce the number of cars on the road; create self sufficient neighborhoods where residents don't need cars to meet their daily needs including employment; encourage smaller cars.

Repair of existing infrastructure should be the priority.

Safety is much more important than speed on urban streets and highways.

Separate bikes from cars.

Somehow correct the engineered idiocy of our freeways like I-84 going west.

Stop the road diets that create more congestion thereby adding emissions and fuel consumption. Add motor vehicle capacity when necessary.

Tax all individuals equally, or implement a user fee for those who use the roads the most.

The funding should go exclusively to improving existing roads, NOT creating new ones, as we can't afford to maintain what we already have. Federal "shovel ready" funds in the last few years have repaired federal highways, but Portland city streets are awful--really scary to bike on some of them, like Front Avenue and SW Cardinell Driver (the lower stretch, just above the SW 12st street bridge to the hairpin turn by the water project--the upper part was repaved and the project was terminated mid-road. What's with that??).

The west side bypass would also be great.

This has been on the back burner to long.

This is our 1st priority to add more lanes like on 217. Why do we have to wait until a road is a parking lot before something is done? And why the hold up on the interstate bridge? I feel sorry for truckers and commercial drivers trying to make a living stuck in traffic.

This policy is my priority especially operation and maintenance of the existing system.

This should be a priority.
We must make big investments in this area instead of bike ways and transit systems.

Work on getting traffic onto streets meant for heavy loads and fast traffic. Big trucks and speeding traffic are always on the 45MPH road in front of my house.

Yes, without unfairly taxing one group to the benefit of another. For example, if infrastructure includes bike paths, spread that cost to all citizens...not just car owners. Consider using funds for overall transit....as opposed to sole investments in extremely high cost, non-flexible light rail versus maximizing use of existing infrastructure to accommodate mass transit and private vehicles.

Yes, yes, yes. Repair our roads and take money from the bike budget.

Yes, more roads please!

Without safe and fully maintained roads, streets, highways the livability of the Metro area is severely reduced. Light rail, bikeways, walkways, bike lanes in no way are the backbone of Metro’s transportation system. Roads, streets and highway’s are. The existing light rail and bus route system underserves the Metro area. The existing road, street and highway system cannot cope with the current traffic flow demands thus reducing the Metro area’s economic viability.

Widen streets that are used by cars and restrict bicycles from using those streets when there are nearby designated bike corridors. Get rid of on-street parking on arterials at ALL hours of the day. And make developers provide parking -- at least one space per apartment or condo -- either under, on top of, beside or behind their three- and four-story units. I would love to see a city planner show me how people are supposed to traverse SE Portland -- or NE Portland, for that matter -- with ease.

Why we spend so much for maintenance!!! 95 % for maintenance tells me with all the money for roads it is not a lack of funds but the management of it!

Use the money you already have and not tax us more! I bought a hybrid to save money on gas and care about the environment...now the government wants to charge me more because I do not use as much?!? My car weighs less so is less damaging to the roads....news flash the rest of society had to budget now it's governments turn! NO NEW TAXES!!!

This policy is my priority especially operation and maintenance of the existing system.

This is our 1st priority to add more lanes like on 217.. why do we have to wait until a road is a parking lot before something is done? and why the hold up on the interstate bridge? I feel sorry for truckers and commercial drivers trying to make a living stuck in traffic.

The west side bypass would also be great.

The REALITY: most people drive and like to drive and like cars.
Tax payers money must be used wisely and for the purpose that it will help the citizens. It is a tax payers money and we must have a say in deciding how it used. We must pay attention to electing someone that care deeply about the citizens as opposed to do as I say. Take it or leave it candidates.

Take care of existing facilities before investing in new facilities. Wasteful to spend on new, fancy electronic highway signs when roads are full of potholes? What does it mean when sign says "recommended speed 35 mph" when the traffic is moving along at 15-20 mph due to high traffic!

Somehow correct the engineered idiocy of our freeways like I-84 going west.

Separate bikes from cars.

See previous notes.

See above. The process of transportation planning and prioritizing projects should include community meetings throughout the Trimet service area, with records of the comments at such meetings included in the final document proposed for adoption by the recommending administrative entities and the administrative and elected officials charged with approving the report(s) and their implementation.

Repair of existing infrastructure should be the priority.

Recent studies (MIT tech blog) show that, for the most part, adding to road/freeway capacity only leads to increased traffic. Let's learn from other cities and cutting-edge science and engineering. We need to invest in community "hub" development IN THE OUTER REGIONS to give people more places to walk TO, and less reason to drive.

Public consultation.

Prioritize street repair and maintenance and intersection/interchange improvements.

Primary focus of funding should be on maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Please pave the roads, and make things easier with cars.

No highways. Equity policy.

More, wider roads that are planned to relieve congestion, and not cause it.

Making sure less affluent neighborhoods are treated with respect and equality in road improvements and repairs.

Maintain what we have first. Too many streets are potholed, or not paved.

Maintain existing infrastructure. Pave unpaved roads in city limits. Build a bigger goddamn bridge to Vancouver, or build a wall to keep them out, I really don't care which.

Keep the roads in good repair, keep the markings sharp and visible.

Keep roads in good repair. Use gas taxes only for road maintenance and construction.

I want to say both yes and no. Timely repair of current infrastructure, but a reluctance to add more roadways.

Get bike lanes out of the street and onto the sidewalks. This system is nuts.

Funding for the maintenance of existing streets and highways should be a priority.
Equity first. Underserved communities need the most help in making their streets safe (i.e., friendly to all users, not just motorists). Emphasize prevention and cheaper frequent maintenance over more costly though less frequent intense maintenance. Place the costs for street repair on those that damage streets the most - cars & trucks. Parking lots & garages should not be exempt business to any street taxes!

Don't overbuild, focus on safety.

Do not CRC us again. Metro, we are counting on YOU to hold the line against investments that prioritize single occupancy vehicles.

Coordinate work so you don't have to undo what just done.

Connectivity should be first. Streets should be safe but let ODOT fund highways. And no new roads.

Clackamas County. You treat Clackamas County like a red-headed stepchild. I have exactly two roads I can use to get to work (15 miles) and one of them is 2-lane, the other is frequently overloaded. This is a commute entirely within the county and is not served by mass transit because of missing links. I can only get there using mass transit by a 2.5 hour (each way) ride through downtown Portland and downtown Beaverton!

Build bigger freeways. Expand I-5 to four lanes each way were ever possible. Re-build the Marquam bridge

Automobiles.

As before.

Again, a goal that is desirable and sensible. The trick is the word "investment". Where are all of the funds going to come from to make these changes? Taxes? Fees? I don't necessarily support widening of streets and highways because of the "if you build it, they will come" phenomenon. Making driving less desirable than using transit, biking, or walking is the goal.

### Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 3:

1. Invest in climate-safe transportation, not more automobile roads.
2. I thought gas taxes would take care of this.
3. Yes or No is a pretty stark contrast. Mainly No. I support maintenance, but rather than increasing road capacity, people should be orienting their lives close to home and growth of housing units should be discouraged.
4. If we build them/maintain them (roads), they (cars) will come. NOT a good idea.
5. The priority should be on non-automobile transportation.
6. Let's not put any more money into car-friendly stuff.
7. The cost to tax payers and the bad economy.
8. The people who use the roads more should pay for them more. The yahoos that don't transit or combine trips and put studs in their tires should pay extra --as a disincentive to continue that lifestyle. The tony neighborhoods shouldn't be able to put speed humps in THEIR area and then zoom down less expensive areas. Either all the streets should get them or none.
Any new development should include costs to improve the infrastructure - too many apartments, condominiums, houses are built, creating traffic congestion where none or little existed before the construction. If you want to add to the population density in this manor then developers or those in the permitting process should also bear the burden of paying for infrastructure to support it.

Departments of Transportation tend to think of streets and highways as belonging to automobiiles (not people/pedestrians) and therefore find that everything needs to be widened, straightened, and connected for CAR use. Safe and reliable are code words for fast and efficient. Fast and efficient should not be the goal. There are many sins commited in the name of "efficiency." Projects to widen streets get approved because people want safe bicycle and pedestrian routes, but instead they get extra lanes of traffic next to sidewalks and bike lanes that are too unpleasant to be used by anyone but the desperate. Improve routes for bikes and pedestrians to optimize connectivity and visibility.

Encouraging more motor vehicle use is not a good policy.

I think maintaining our current road system should be the priority but do not see a real need for more roads.

Taking traffic density and spreading it out into neighborhoods and creating more "connected" roadways that spread air and noise traffic pollution is not the way forward.

We don't need wider roads, we need more connectivity.

YES FOR MAINTAINING what we have. NO NEW construction, even for widening. We have funds for maintenance. We've been paying that bill. MSTP, for YEARS. Time to start using it for what it was meant for. STOP building new roads to support development. DEVELOPERS SHOULD PAY THEIR OWN WAY. ALL THE WAY!

Cost.

We have enough concrete. We don't need anymore widened streets. If people don't have incentive to get out of cars, they won't.

We need more lanes not trains. Invest in more highways and throughfares!

Who and how many use this? Auto owners shouldn't have to foot the bill for people riding bikes, walkers, runners. Surveys are needed to find out how many people use these services, then determine how much the cost would be for each group, then divide the number of users into the cost.

Repair existing but no more widening...stop encouraging car use

No more widening of roads! I am not opposed to repairing roads, but we have enough pavement. It's time to get people out of their cars.

Spending money to enlarge our roads will just make roads more appealing and continue our excessive carbon footprint.

After walkers and bikers are taken care of.

Build more roads.

I'd rather see more public transport options.
Maintenance of present infrastructure is neglected. The potholes on my street are so extensive they need to be mowed to keep the weeds down. The temporary asphalt glop that gets put in on occasion doesn't last the year. When streets are repaved, opportunities to decrease pavement (increase greened areas) should be taken. Keep the roads twisty and winding. People drive more safely on them.

Safe streets only in terms of bicyclists and pedestrians being safe. Highways do not belong in this policy. Automobiles are safe enough now to protect drivers and passengers - it's those who are HIT by the drivers that need protection!

Should focus on transit not roads.

Streets and highways are already safe, reliable and connected. Put this project aside.

The goals have already been met!

How to make improvements without raising taxes. Will the benefit outweigh the costs? Will the improvements be welcomed by the taxpayer? Will the taxpayers utilize the "improvements"?

I said "no", which is misleading, because of course I suppor safety improvements to the roads and highways. However, I don't necessarily favor widening streets and highways at the expense of bike, pedestrian, and transit projects. These active/transit projects should take priority.

I support the safety and reliability of our streets and highways but have observed that "connected" impacts neighborhoods by creating new streets and widening streets.

Use the ones we have but keep them in better repair.

I DO support making roads wider, safer and more connected but NOT at an increase of tax burden to our already overtaxed citizens in this region! ODOT gets enough tax revenue to keep our current infrastructure running and operating in PRISTENE condition but they mismanage the funds so grossly and negligently that we are left with crumbling infrastructure as they scream and cry for more, MORE, MORE... Just like our failing but overfunded School system tends to do! If you're not getting it right within the budget you already have then you're a dismal failer and need to be FIRED and replaced with personnel who will get it done withing the existing budget and do it right!

This would not be a place I would spend money except for basic maintenance. Considering we are living with our WWII investment, we need to look 70-80 years down the road and I don't think that means pothole repairs.

Current level is acceptable and could be lowered if more people use public transpo.

I have lived in other parts of the country. Our roads are great here. People here tend to whine a lot.

We need to move away from cars, toward public transit in the 21st century.

Reduce investment in traditional modes of transportation; ie. cars. The more streets and highways there are, the more cars will use them.
Our streets are already reliable and connected. Implement stricter drivers’ license standards and streets will be safer. It should be really clear that driving is a privilege for safe, responsible adults.

I checked no because I don’t think we need to spend large amounts on this area. We should continue to improve intersections and turn lanes and small projects to improve safety, but we already have a good street system.

Of course I support safety and maintenance, but not road widening.

Encourage less traffic.

Although important, I think there are other things the community should be doing that are higher priority. State and federal funds are available for the freeway system.

Let’s don’t destroy neighborhoods to put in these streets. Are there options for underground streets or elevated roadways?

No more money!

We spend far too much repairing studded tire damage while leaving many neighborhoods with awful streets.

I support safer roads, but would be more interested in alternative transportation options rather than widening existing roads or making new roads.

If building more roads was the problem our metro area would be perfect by now. The problem is that people are not living in the communities in which they work. Let’s use those billions of dollars to set up an online job-switching service, encourage working from home & paying better wages so service workers can afford to live in the communities they serve. More roads? Nah.

No policy implemented by trimet or the city of Portland has been beneficial to the citizens of Portland or Multnomah county in the last decade.

Spending 3% of the budget on roads compared to the wasteful spending in other categories just shows that its time for civil disobedience against the idiots in office.

I would not support widening of streets, when does that end? We need to focus on other fixes. I would support keeping the road system in good repair, building a well-connected network of streets.

Keeping highways in good repair important, but expansion, which would encourage more car/truck traffic, should be avoided.

Do not expand roads. Improve intersections in terms of better light timing, turn pockets, etc., but WE DO NOT NEED A GREAT NUMBER OF ROAD CAPACITY. We need better alternatives.

It would seem from recent actions, that to implement this means increasing taxes: TUF in Hillsboro (with subsequent increase!!), WACO proposed fee, and Oregon increase in registration tax. Give me a break - road tax needs to be MILEAGE BASED. Pay for use.
The entire region, especially suburbs like Hillsboro and Beaverton, are far too auto-oriented. Stop developments that require cars for transportation needs. Walking and biking needs to be safe and practical transportation options.

We have plenty of roads. Aside from better management of traffic lights, let's easy back on endless road growth.

Do nothing that encourages driving.

Focus in developing roads should be on how to include carpool and bus lanes, bicycle paths, etc. Make the highways toll roads to support necessary development and discourage so much driving. Use 'EZ pass' to collect the tolls. 217 should be a toll road. The I-5 bridge should be a toll bridge.

I strongly disagree that widening streets and highways does not ultimately result in reduced morbidity and mortality due to traffic. When street size increases, so does the volume of traffic, thereby creating more pollution and greater risk of motor vehicle wrecks.

I understand that some road growth is inevitable, and I do support keeping roads in good repair. I am always wary of road widening and increase in roads, though. People seem to believe this will make traffic flow better and be safer, but I think it tends to just encourage more cars driving faster. Of course, the best course of action depends on the circumstance!

More focus on alternative transportation. If it is made easier than driving, folks will make this choice more often.

This already exists and the safe bike routes are more important to me.

We can never build enough roads so let's make them better multi mode and use zoning and planning to reduce the average trip length and more of the trips possible without a car.

We need to move away from streets and highways. Keep the ones we have bu look for alternative transportation systems.

I think general street maintenance is very important. But street expansion would be a waste of funding, increasing active transport and mass transit systems would be a better return for the Metro district. Both in terms of transportation capacity and in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Road system is adequately developed. More lanes will result in more cars.

Create a transportation infrastructure that encourages people to drive less.

I think the main priority should be keeping roads in good repair, not building new ones or widening further. When roads are repaired, always look for opportunities to add stormwater treatment, bike lanes and wider sidewalks with street trees.

I'm of two minds. I don't support just letting roadways fall into complete disrepair and become blighted hazards, but I definitely don't support doing anything to make it more attractive to drive a car around here. I support maintenance, but not heavy investment.
My observation has been that when roads are widened it just increases traffic. I'd invest in almost everything else first.

New highways and connections can only make congestion worse, separate neighborhoods, and worsen water run off.

Public transit should take priority over highway and street improvements.

The money should be going to public transit.

This has little benefit for non automobile drivers.

We have enough streets as it is.

Again these are separate issues. Roads should not be widened but they should be maintained. People who move into areas without existing streets should be prepared to pay for those streets themselves and developers should pay fees to cover their damage to streets.

Building wider and faster streets and highways adds to the problems causes by sprawl and dependence on personal automobiles. If safety is truly the issue and not just a smokescreen, the quickest and cheapest way to make our streets safer is to lower the speeds that drivers travel by enforcing the current speed limits. Install more red light cameras and speed cameras.

Highways get more than enough attention already.

I am not opposed to maintaining roadways, I just don't want to raise the investment in maintenance beyond current levels at the expense of ped/bike safety & transit projects.

I answered no because I questioned what is meant by safe. If a bicyclist is weaving between cars and in and out of lanes and putting his life at risk, what can possibly be done to make this safe. There is no upper limit to the amount of money that would need to be spent to make the roadway environment safe for the irresponsible biker.

I do not agree with widening the highways. It will induce demand for driving and our goals are to Reduce greenhouse gases from cars and trucks. Investments should instead be made to make transit more accessible.

I do not support the widening of streets and highways at all. I support the routine maintenance of our existing system and/or 'road diets' and lane reductions.

I don't support widening our streets. We need to do more to slow traffic down through neighborhoods, more transit options to get people out of their cars. More affordable housing close in so people don't have to commute in their cars.

I think we should skip road widening and focus on completing the active transportation network throughout the region, and implementing targeted road/highway safety measures for all users.

I wish there was a "sort-of" option above. I don't support investment in highway widening or more car infrastructure. I do support fixing potholes and building bike lanes/separated bikeways.
It is well known that adding roads simply increases usage. We have enough roads. What we need are more bike and walk-friendly ways to move about, and more streetcar/light rail.

It’s not that I don’t support road maintenance, but that our focus should be on transit.

Low priority for more roads. Focus on safety at most.

Mass transit should be prioritized over car infrastructure.

Multiple studies have proven that building wider and larger streets leads to more congestion, pollution and waste of resources.

No widening of streets. No more building new streets. No widening of highways. Instead increased park and ride options, bike options, better/faster transit that meets the need of diverse people.

No wider streets. Maintenance OK, but we have enough roadways and miles-driven per-person has been declining since 2003. Without constraints people don’t adapt. Don’t grow the system, make it more efficient.

Non commercial traffic should be encouraged to use transit and bikes and pedestrian methods of transport. On street parking on heavily trafficked streets can be eliminated, if widening is needed. More preferable would be to supplant parking with colored bike lanes.

Public transportation and alternative modes of transportation are more cost effective.

The current quality of Portland’s streets and the level of maintenance is adequate. Some streets are not improved or need improvement but they are generally low volume streets with good alternatives nearby.

The most livable great cities in the world are horrible to drive in.

The streets are too wide, too fast and to dangerous. We need slower speed limits and to divert cars from bike and walk routes.

This is throwing good money after bad. We need narrower streets, lower speed limits, and fewer streets to maintain. I do not support paying for faster driving, increased driving, and more fatalities and injuries.

Traffic will always be traffic. Well connected network of streets is unnecessary if alternative modes of transportation are in place.

We already have a huge built out road network.

We already spend too much money on highways.

We can already get where we need to go with cars on the roadway network. I support keeping the system in good repair, but we should be moving far away from widening of streets and highways. Climate Smart means not relying on carbon-based vehicles such as private cars. If we invest in transit and active transportation, we don’t need to expand our roadway system, even as the region grows.

We don’t need more investment in roads at this time, unless we are willing as a country to take money away from unnecessary, destructive parts of the economy like defense spending or subsidies to fossil fuel companies.

We have higher priorities I think than this at this time.
We have to let the roadways become more congested to make mass transit widespread and economically viable.

We will be using cars less, trains more. We've got plenty of roads for vehicles, keep funding the same and maintain what we have. Widening streets makes them more dangerous because cars feel more comfortable going faster. They are a step in the wrong direction as well as far as strong communities and climate action go. Widening streets makes them more dangerous. Cars will go as fast as they feel comfortable. Higher speeds equal more accidents. Wider streets will just increase car traffic. It's counterproductive.

Yes and no, as we transition into a new era we need to be more focused on local investments and creating a system that works in balance with work and living opportunities. The need for excessive vehicles on our highway system needs to be mitigated and other forms of moving people along this systems explored including bike, train, or even horse again!

An appropriate investment in active transport will do more good than any increase in spending on roads and automotive infrastructure. REASON: each person who walks, uses a bike, or takes a bus or MAX is one less car on the road. So reduce the amount of automotive traffic, and current budget levels will be enough to keep the roads in good repair. Put emphasis on increasing Park And Ride and similar hybrid transportation (bikes on buses, etc).

Believe they should be kept in good repair, but DO NOT need roads to be wider. Making them wider makes them less accessible to walking. Focus on public transit and biking. For a very long time we have prioritized the roadway and highway system and neglected the state of other forms of transportation including transit and active transportation. Do maintenance on the existing system and focus on transit and active transportation.

I'm not sure what more to do. More can be done to make them safer by having fewer cars on the road. Consider allowing carsharing. Increased "support" in the form of new road taxes should be created from user fees only. A huge portion of taxes already goes to subsidizing auto use, which is destructive in ways we are all familiar with. User fees provide income based on usage and provide a disincentive to drive, lowering overall costs.

Let's keep fixing what we've got, but focus on more types of transit options. Maintenance is important but building more roads is not. Money has been poured into these networks for decades, we should focus on maintenance, and small revenue-positive investments, and affordable design changes that improve user behavior/compliance.

Vehicle miles traveled is declining. Priority for commercial truck mobility.
When I was growing up, annual incomes over $250,000 were taxed at 91%. Unless there is an adequate tax base to support public infrastructure, additional investments are consistently too little too late. Failure to promote progressive taxation undermines all government services.

"Widening streets and highways" = cutting down trees. I see that happening everywhere roads are being widened or altered. All that tree-cutting is appalling and short-sighted; it decimates the tree canopy and raises temps, not to mention that it looks awful. Ultimately, it makes the citizens suspect that Portland’s leaders aren’t as progressive as they tell us they are.

Do NOT widen the streets! All that means, translated, is that more trees and shrubbery get cut down. It happened on Arthur, along the waterfront, along Naito, along Barbur. Streets that used to be nice and cool because of the tree canopy now are blisteringly hot like so many other streets. It’s awful. If you’re really interested in a livable city, a tree canopy is essential--Portland’s summers, as anyone who’s lived through the last five or eight will tell you, can be hideously hot. Shade cast by trees is known to lower temps and therefore make passing underneath or being nearby more pleasant.

The money is already in the budget, stop asking for additional money. Use what you have for what it is intended. The roads are in bad repair because money was used for bike paths and other projects not related to maintaining roads. Targeted widening of streets sounds like you’re going to add bike lanes. I do not trust Portland politicians to do anything positive for automobile drivers.

Do NOT widen our streets and highway. What an incredibly dangerous thing to do.

Highway capacity should not be expanded. Closures and tear downs of highways should be done instead. Tear down I-5 alone the east bank of the Willamette and sign I-205 as I-5 instead. Highways cut off people from the riverfront and isolate neighborhoods. Cap I-405 though downtown Portland.

Only do this to some extent, but transit, biking and walking facilities need more funding.

The funding for transportation is limited and has been extremely heavy on supporting auto transport. A healthier apportionment would mean less funding for autocentric transportation.

They are already connected. There is no need to further enhance this system. Period. This policy is just a means for expansion. Disconnected suburban streets can only be turned into a network by condemning properties to allow for new connections. I’d support this but would anyone else?

Certainly keep the system in good repair but we don’t need to widen highways. Provide more mode options.

Focus road spending on safety programs, especially mitigating the dangerous conditions created by large streets and highways in the first place. Convenient driving = deadly walking and bicycling. Safety projects are essential to support transit, because transit lines run on large streets, which are more dangerous to walk on. No one should have to put their life on the line just to get to the bus stop across the street.

Honestly, safety and multi-mode travel is a higher priority. I’m for basic maintenance and lower travel speeds, to save money all around and in the long term.
I support repairs, but not roadway widening or any new freeways.

I support some of what you are saying here. I think the focus needs to be on the repair of the city streets. The road on which I live is not well kept, but the road by the high school up on block was just completely redone. It got electronic traffic signals while SE 50th at Woodward has no crosswalk and people - including the high school students - regularly dodge traffic to run across while cars speed down the hill.

I think a main priority for this work should be to ensure that the roads that cyclists are funneled onto are free of pot holes, cracks, and other dangers.

I would rather see money spent on public transit and bike paths first.

I'm not in support of widening our streets and providing more capacity. I think we need to work on figuring out how to get less people driving in single occupancy vehicles if we really care about climate change.

Maintain the current system. That's it. I do NOT support additional widening of roads. If we are serious about addressing the challenge of global climate change it is not going to be done with the single occupancy vehicle. Encourage more transit use, encourage more active transportation, encourage more living closer to work, and encourage more telecommuting. There is not an example in this country of a city that has built enough streets to accommodate their car traffic.

Make the streets we currently have SAFE FOR PEDESTRIANS before spending any money on roads and bikes UNLESS it adds safety to pedestrians.

Plan for motor vehicle reduction, not growth! Focus on preventative maintenance and make developers pay 100% for system upgrades and expansions. No more public subsidies for motor vehicle infrastructure expansions.

Safety and preventative maintenance should remain top priorities but, in many cases, road widening and other road network expansions are ultimately losing propositions and aren't worth their exorbitant costs.

Taxes that we are already paying should be used for this. No additional money should be involved.

The question asks if we want to make streets safe first. No mention of how to do this exists. I read this question with the extra details as how to make it more convenient for businesses. If it were re-worded to help people, I'd be more likely to be in favor of it.

The road system should be maintained, but should not be expanded in most cases. In areas that are poorly connected, new road construction may be justified, but only if it highly prioritizes bike, pedestrian and transit traffic and disincentivizes single occupancy vehicle traffic. Under no circumstances should roads be widened, as induced demand will quickly catch up and cause increased congestion and climate damage.

This effort is making street travel (cars/bikes/pedestrians) more dangerous.

This is a qualified no, because I don't think there's a direct or necessary connection between widening streets and highways and improving traffic flow and safety. I think alternatives to widening and expanding should be pursued to their fullest before widening streets and incentivizing auto use and sprawl.
Transportation diversity. So long as our transportation budget disproportionately favors cars, so too will our residents. Equalize spending across all modes so that transit, walking, and biking are just as safe and efficient as driving alone.

We already have streets everywhere. This is not as important as the transit system.

Widening of roads does not decrease congestion. While it's true that we need to maintain our roads, we should be aiming for a city where the number of trips by car is vastly diminished. With car ownership decreasing and articulated goals developed around transit and active transportation, we should not (except when absolutely necessary) be prioritizing the development of additional roads and highways.

Widening will increase greenhouse gas emissions through induced demand. This is not a good strategy. Repair yes, widening now. Repurpose current motor vehicle lanes as walking, biking, and transit space to get big reductions in emissions and improvements in health at low cost.

While safety is one thing, priority should be given to making things work for all forms of transportation including sidewalks safer.

Cars get enough already. Make motorists pay for road system.

I suspect that the long-term costs of better roads will be higher than the long-term costs of mass transit, when environmental and social costs are considered - but the analysis must be done.

I think more money should be spent on sustainable transportation - transit, biking and walking.

It is time to stop investing in individual cars.

They currently seem fine to me.

I don't agree with driving from an ethical standpoint, so I can't comment on this issue.

I should really say yes, but at a lower priority than the previous two.

If anything, in order to promote non-automobile forms of transport and to save the city money, roads should be actively downsized and speed limits lowered, while accommodating more sustainable forms of transport.

If you guys wanted a bunch of "YES" answers (and judging from how these questions are phrased, you do), you could have just given people 1 option to choose from.

I'm all for increasing road safety; however, please consider that this may best be accomplished by reducing space on the public road system for private automobiles and increasing space for active transportation modes. In the long run, it will be much more valuable for the economy, public health, and image of the city to invest more in safe and effective active transportation infrastructure. In fact, investment in active transportation should over time lessen the economic burden we currently have maintaining automobile infrastructure in its current condition.

They already are safe, reliable and connected. To do much more than we are doing now will increase our already high tax burden.

This just generates more traffic that makes other modes more dangerous.
We have enough of this already. It just increases traffic and makes other modes more dangerous and uncomfortable.

We spend too much on widening and all it does is kill people and make congestion worse.

While I support the benefits listed, I do not believe that, for example, widening roads will be the cheapest or best way to accomplish these goals. The roads should be kept in good repair. However, it is more important to reduce speeds, provide additional enforcement around cell phone use and texting, and increase safety through other traffic-calming methods.

Compared to investment in alternative transportation infrastructure, the roads seem to have plenty of funding already. Bridges that are unsafe should of course be repaired, but encouraging other ways of getting around will benefit more people in the long run and improve the quality of life for us all.

Don't widen streets; they lead to faster speeds which is more dangerous to bikers and pedestrians. It's ironic that you say this will reduce risk of traffic fatalities.

Enough is already being charged...do the best you can with what you are collecting.

Highway and street widening is a bad idea. Why encourage more cars? Makes cities less livable.

I don't own a car.

I support maintenance of existing streets, but not the widening of them, or development of new ones.

I-5 should be removed along the Willamette. Consider Induced Demand: narrow the streets, make traffic slower, make driving less convenient than biking walking or transit.

If we want to encourage people not to drive then don't make more room for people to drive.

Keeping roads in good repair is a priority, but with limited financial resources, widening or expanding networks should be secondary to providing safe walking and bicycling routes.

Less of a priority for me as this strategy - auto and freight travel have plenty of existing constituents and dominates our funding cycles.

Let the big roads decay. They just allow suburbanites to speed through places instead of interacting with places. Autocentricity is outdated and for former generations. Tax vehicles more heavily through registration, gas tax, vehicle weight tax, congestion pricing to pay for any arterial road maintenance. Repaving high crash corridors is a joke, as it just allows the vehicular violence on our communities to persist with high speeds and priority to auto users. (P.S. i also drive a commercial truck 3-5 times a week and still think cars are given way too much priority) We should build cities with people in mind, not cars.

Maintain the roads of course, but limit growth so expansion is not needed.

Maintenance is ok, but don't widen streets/highways. Use lots of traffic calming to slow down traffic.

No, I think keeping bridges in working order is great but we have too many miles of roadway and not enough money to keep them all in good repair. Focus on transit, walking and biking.

Our current level of support seems adequate.
Private Autos can go too fast and have too much unimpeded access to the city. This is habitat for humans, not cars! Repave neighborhood greenways, not arterials. Repaving arterials, just allows cars to go faster and cause more damage to people and our social fabric. I drive for work purposes 2-5 times a week with a big truck and i think cars and trucks go too fast for a dense urban environment.

That investing in fossil fuels isn't sustainable.

The regional street system is largely complete. At this late stage in its development, a person using an auto within the region can get from anywhere, to anywhere, with a reasonable amount of safety for themselves. Any additional investments in this system should be targeted towards making it safer and adding capacity for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit users.

We certainly don't need wider streets or highways. Doesn't actually help access to everyday amenities and only encourages more driving.

We do not need any more additional lanes. We need to better manage and prioritize commercial vehicles over single occupancy vehicles.

We do not need to widen any roads! We need to be smarter. We can do basic maintenance with out spending a fortune to increase car based transportation.

We need safe roadways, but we should not encourage increasing traffic by enlarging or increasing roadways. People need to see the negatives of driving so that the positives of alternative transportation makes more sense to them.

We should do everything we can to discourage able-bodied people from using automobiles.

We should not continue to fund highways to the levels that we currently do now. We should have 24 hour Multipassenger Vehicle Lanes on all highways. We should take lanes out of highways as well as taking highways out of urban cores (like Vancouver BC).

We should repair roads, but should not widen any existing roads.

While safety improvements should be made, the road network is sufficiently connected and built out.

As someone who uses our roads daily, it is clear that our streets and highways are inadequate and insufficiently maintained. But every dollar put to assisting the movement of cars is a dollar better spent on assisting the more efficient movement of people.

Cheap projects to improve connectivity seem to be worth it, but building and widening major arterials and highways is not worth the cost. These sorts of projects just increase our down the road costs.

Dollars for pavement are better spent elsewhere.

Emphasis should be on safety above all. We should not be building additional roads or bridges across the Columbia unless bike, transit, and pedestrians are given adequate space and consideration. We don't need more highways. We should discourage driving.
Enough already on the expansion of auto roadways. We must resist this tendency and instead focus our efforts and money on getting people onto public transit, riding bicycles and walking.

For "short trips" what if we made them easier by bike or walking. Running errands within 2 miles of home or work by bike can actually be faster than driving considering traffic and parking time. Riding to do errands also increase physical activity making people healthier.

Highways should be kept in good repair, but we don’t need more of them.

I am more interested in a car-free lifestyle and the positive impact that has on the environment.

I believe we should have reliable streets, but I'd like to see personal vehicles banned within city limits which would limit the need for constant repair.

I do support some of the most urgent road improvements, BUT they should be a lower priority, with traffic-reducing investments such as public transport and active transport coming first. Improving the efficiency and network of streets should be prioritized over widening (unless the widening is to make room for bike traffic or sidewalks).

I don't think there should be any building of new roads. I do think we should make sure that our present roads are well-maintained.

Keeping streets in good repair makes sense. Widening streets does not. If city streets are becoming congested, we should focus on ways to reduce the number of people driving alone and reduce the times/places where large trucks are allowed.

Maintaining streets in good repair is very important and should be instead of targeted widening of streets and highways. With good existing streets, there should be lessened need for new, improving or expanding projects.

Making it easier to drive places increases the number of automobile trips.

More important to put money into transit.

Pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Streets and highways should be maintained and developed using user fees (gas tax, etc.) only. We don’t need more of them, we need more transit and less emphasis on the auto.

This has been over-invested in in the past. Let other modes catch up.

This is important, but the focus should be swayed to transit and active transportation development. Substantive investment should be made in support of alternative transportation (with the exception of maintaining current infrastructure - repairs).

We already have our street system. Yes, it needs to be repaired and improved, but "more investment" is too broad a goal to support with a blank slate. Probabably 90% of capital expenses are for roads already.
We should not be allocating more money to create an auto-centric system. We do not need wider roads or highways. In fact, we should be narrowing some of the streets within dense neighborhood areas. That money spent on pedestrian/cycling infrastructure will see a much larger ROI.

Already too much of a priority.

Focus on maintenance of existing infrastructure and expand only with transit or zoning enhancements. Get people out of cars.

Generally studies show that more streets do not alleviate traffic congestion. Maintenance is definitely important. Our roads are torn up by studded tires when it seems that if it snows/ices in the city everything closes down anyway, and if you go to the mountain you can use chains. Can we eliminate the used of studded tires?

I am in favor keeping road surfaces in good repair and paving streets inside cities that are gravel. But not widening to allow more cars.

I care about emergency response and freight, but encouraging auto use is NOT part of a climate plan. Metro has planning mandates other than climate planning-at least put resources that encourage car travel somewhere else.

Oh sure, streets should be safe, but there are lots of plans calling for safe streets! The climate plan isn't the place for calls to build more roads. We should have a serious conversation about climate change when road growth comes up--the fact that road builders will be able to waive the climate plan's approval is detrimental to thoughtful process and implementation. If nothing else, eliminate widening and street additions from this plan.

Please do not build more roads and highways. They are so expensive, and only encourage more driving. I have a hard time believing that this strategy will actually make Portland more "climate smart."

Reduce emphasis on road capacity to encourage a move away from personal autos. Maintain roads for the benefit of public transit and freight. Shift long-distance travel to non-auto methods.

Streets and highways should be kept in good repair but should not be widened or expanded.

This question asks about too many things at once. Making streets safe? Of course. Investing in more connected highways - no thanks.

We already have an extremely well connected system of streets that serve automobiles. Lanes absolutely do not need to be added. This approach only induces demand and maintains congestion rather than solving it. This is 100% antithetical to notion of a climate smart community. The only exception should be for road repair and maintenance. This is a critical function for maintaining our roadway system, but it should be coupled with improvements to bicycle and pedestrian sections of the same right of way.

What is the impact of "widening streets and highways"? Is it simply to invite more people to drive on those streets and highways?
While street maintenance is important (streets are our most expensive asset) efforts to increase traffic capacity or flow of private vehicles should not be encouraged. Every road widening project everywhere has demonstrated that induced demand will eliminate any benefit to congestion, while simultaneously putting more cars on the road, leading to increased emissions.

Widening streets and highways in urban areas is a mug's game - just postpones the inevitable.

Concentrate on 20 minute neighborhoods Do not widen streets for cars only If you widen a street, provide pedestrian / bike amenities and landscaping. lower speed limits on car highways to 50 MPH Do not financially support bad development and urban sprawl (even within the urban growth boundary) with bad street design.

Conditionally, yes: We need to maintain what we have. What we absolutely do not need is wider roads and more highways. Safety should be the priority, not usual level of service measurements such as number of cars moved or lack of congestion.

Continuing to invest disproportionately in automotive traffic is anti-Portland, and not in our best long-term interest.

Funds should be given first to safe and pot hole free streets and knock off the stupid blockades too many streets have to make autos have to circle around the neighborhood to get on what should be a through street like S. E. Lincoln & 39th.

Given relative priorities, I would rather see funds put into public and active transportation before spending on auto throughput.

I support good repair, well-connected network; but feel that this could be used in conjunction with widening of streets & highways to mean new freeways. Better roads running east-west through the coast and cascades are needed as well as an improved north-south route on the east side of the Cascades to allow economic growth on that side of the state.

I support road maintenance. In most cases, I do not support road widening and would oppose investment in road widening.

I think the road network is far more complete than the network of sidewalks, trails, biking infrastructure. Some investment in freight related projects is needed but not just more lanes for more cars.

I would support good maintenance plans, but not many widening projects - I'd prefer to see less street parking instead.

I'd rather see all that money go towards light rail. Let the freeways crumble.

Improving streets by widening them and making more room for easier and quicker car travel is not desirable.

It's difficult to say an absolute no - my 'no' means let's deemphasize road investments. we've been doing that for so long and we need a more balanced approach. we don't need new roads, we need better investment in transit, walking and biking - every planner should ask: what if I don't have a car? If we asked that one question, we'd have such a better system.
My answer is more a partial yes, than a no, but I want to emphasize the importance of public transit. The partial yes is for emergency response. Otherwise, we should be spending our resources reducing vehicle traffic.

Not in favor of street widening - it only encourages faster vehicle travel at the expense of safety for other road users.

Other species, habitat loss and the possibility that by implementing such measures that we increase traffic (e.g. widening streets).

Plan for decreased auto traffic rather than building to accommodate or encourage more traffic.

Reduce amount of streets.

Roads shouldn't be widened, they should be used more efficiently by, for example, discouraging SOCs in favor of all other modes.

Safe and connected, yes. Wider - not so much. I support reliability, connectivity, and good maintenance if we can implement a user-based funding system to cover those costs, such as road tolling or a VMT tax.

Spend money on maintenance rather than little-used systems like WES and streetcars.

Spending should prioritize other modes of transit.

Tax gas and make highways horrible so that people will ride transit. Build light rail not roads.

We already spend too much money on the road network.

We are done building more streets. Focus on maintenance only.

We have enough streets as it is, maybe we need more connectivity and fewer cul de sacs in the suburbs, what we need is more small scale commercial districts (not malls) within walking distance of more homes. Too much of the region is zoned as residential sanctuary, which forces people to drive.

We need to better maintain the streets we have, but adding to them will increase auto use which we want to discourage.

Well-maintained roads are critical and system connectivity is also important, but I don't support widening roads and highways because it doesn't relieve congestion. Getting people on bikes, transit, and/or closer to work should do a better job of relieving congestion and will free up space for freight, which cannot make that shift. I do support road maintenance though, because it does support drivers and it only gets more expensive the longer it's put off. Also, driving should be priced. It's a much more subsidized system than many people realize.

We've over-invested in highways.

Widening streets increases traffic speeds which reduces safety.

I support maintaining roads for safety but strongly oppose widening streets and enhancing capacity. It is extremely expensive and will not address traffic issues. If you build it, they will come. May actually discourage people from seeking more sustainable forms of transportation.
I support maintaining the existing street network, but not building more roads. If connectivity is desired accomplish it by promoting active transportation and investing in active transportation facilities.

I support maintaining the existing system, but not widening streets. I'm in favor of maintaining what we have that makes sense in the overall plan to reduce dependency on cars. I would not be in favor of widening streets. I think they should be narrower so people drive more slowly.

Keep motor vehicle miles steady or reduce them.

More roads, wider roads is not the answer, we will just fill it up with more cars because we can. There's no outcome except total collapse of livability if there are constantly widening roads and more cars, even if they are clean cars.

Neighborhoods need to be protected from through traffic where it does not currently exist.

Portland streets are not safe right now because the street laws are not being enforced, speed bumps aren't being added, and speed limits are not being changed to accommodate the growth in our neighborhoods. I do not support repairing streets themselves right now because the only thing that is slowing drivers down are the potholes and broken up pavement. If the city just paves streets drivers will just go faster through residential neighborhoods. I would only support funding if the city can enforce and upgrade the current speed limits, signs, and add speed bumps.

Safer is critical; however, a wider street doesn't mean safer for everyone. Speeds increase with wider streets and it makes it impossible for the street to be used by anyone other than a motorized vehicle. Adding connectivity could reduce pressure on the local streets without good access to the arterials.

Safety - yes, roadway widening - no.

Some parts of highways may need to be improved but it's okay now.

Streets in the PDX area are already highly connected. We need to be smarter about existing connections.

The on ramp in the SW for the Ross Island Bridge is terrible. Ridiculous that everyone has to go through that four way stop.

There has already been to much money dumped into highways. Expansion of the highway system simply creates more urban sprawl which creates even more traffic. The last few decades has shown that we are not prepared to even maintain what we have, let alone pay for further roadways. Put the money into regional rail, bus and bicycle facilities.
This question seems poorly worded. When you tie streets (local) with highways (state and/or federal), I have a problem. These seem like two separate issues. Sure, fix the potholes and pave some of those gravel roads in NE. Create a provision for all those house flippers and real estate developers to provide sidewalks and parking. The crazy thing about PDX is we allow all of this in-fill housing but aren't considering infrastructure. Where all of those new tenants are going to park? We allow huge corporations to build multiplex shopping malls and high rise buildings but they contribute very little to our infrastructure or our tax base. What is wrong with this equation?

Though streets and highways do need to be kept safe and in a good state of repair, building more/widening streets and highways just leads to more use via this mode, and this just compounds the problems. Other modes that decrease reliance on traffic via streets and highways need to be invested in first.

We talk a lot about street repair these days, but I've seen more improvement in streets, sidewalks, and bike lanes and trails in the last year than I've seen in the last 10. We do not need more, just better priorities.

You lost me when you added the widening bit. We can make streets and highways safe, reliable and connected without widening. It means focusing on safety, staying up on maintaining our streets, and looking for opportunities to improve street connectivity where streets don't go through to allow shorter trips instead of forcing everyone out onto the arterials.

Disagree that we need to widen roads/ freeways, increase capacity for car traffic.

Safe, YES. Wider? NO. Streets should not be prioritized over pedestrians.

Streets that exist should be kept in good repair. NO more highways!!!!!!! Keep those built safe and do not allow more to be built.

Widening highways only increases traffic. Not a solution. I do support maintaining existing roads in good repair, since it's less expensive to keep maintained than to repair streets in very poor condition.

Encourage other forms of transportation. No new highways. Zoning to encourage the separation of bikes and peds from vehicles. Maintaining existing roads.

I feel like our streets and highways are safe and reliable as they are. I do not see what might be improved here.

I feel that infrastructure for automobiles is already too highly prioritized to the detriment of the community and the environment.

I think streets in Portland are already reliable and connected. I am not sure what people mean when they say this.

I think this is expensive and does not help us get closer to a physically healthier region with low greenhouse emissions.
Investing more into automotive transportation is not going to help reduce emissions or be effective in reducing our climate impact. Widening streets and making highways easier to travel on will only increase the amount of people traveling by automobile until capacity is once again met. We should in fact be making it more difficult/slower for people to travel by automobile. And freight transportation should get much higher priority on our roads than personal autos.

It's a little silly to say that I don't support making streets safe, but it seems a faulty question. I like improving streets, particularly bikeways. I don't like road widening projects. They seem wasteful projects. The resources should be put into multi-modal transport instead, or trees to separate cars and pedestrians, etc.

Just keep things paved. I don't know how the low-power/high-efficiency lighting is going. Has it gone solar anywhere yet? Other than that, it's pretty good.

No more highways.

Repair: yes. But when up to half of the roadway is dedicated to on-street parking, it's wasted money. Widening: as recently demonstrated by Matthew Turner of the University of Toronto and Gilles Duranton of the University of Pennsylvania, widening roads actually makes traffic worse by inducing demand. It is bad policy. Network: the road system is already pretty well connected. Pedestrian and bike systems are not, and that's where the money should be spent. Other: spend money to implement congestion pricing to improve efficiency.

Roads are fine as they are.

Streets are already connected. Widening will just add traffic. I only support the maintenance piece of this.

Streets being in good repair is a fine investment, but the cost to do that for our existing streets network is unsustainable. We need to cut back on our road network in order to have something we can afford the upkeep on.

Streets should be maintained and expanded. They are safe enough.

They only improve certain hoods.

Think with car sharing and UBER we can use existing streets better and reduce parking area

We already have a well-connected street and highway system. Widening of roads is not required.

We need to discourage driving as much as possible. Make what we have safe, but don't widen or expand the system.

We should depave many streets to reduce maintenance costs. Studies have shown more streets only makes more traffic.

We've invested enough in highways in automobile mobility. Yes, keep our current system in good repair, but I do not support any targeted widening of the single biggest component that already dominates our transportation system.
Widening increases the problem. We need narrower roads if anything. It needs to be more difficult to drive. This will increase demand for alternative transportation modes then comes the money. Most Americans are not going to give up their cars for everyday transportation unless it is extremely inconvenient and there is a cheaper/faster/easier way.

Yes to maintenance of existing system. But we can't widen our way to better climate; it will only induce demand.

You need to discourage people from living lives that are dependent on having a car.

Maintenance, sure, but not much else. I support making neighborhood streets unusable as through-streets, as Vancouver BC has. But with studies showing that traffic expands to fill any void given it, I think we should invest in eliminating the NEED for traffic in the first place: vibrant community cores, disbursed employment & enjoyment, and income-balanced neighborhoods. Should I have to drive to find a decent park to take a walk in? In Cully I do.

Encourage people to drive less. Existing roads should be kept in good repair, but I don't support widening of streets unless it's to add walking or biking paths.

I clicked "No" because ODOT currently has the 1950s "traffic engineer" mentality in which roads are designed to carry as many cars through an area as quickly as possible--and as wide as possible. This not only does NOT work, but it completely destroys all locally based businesses along these corridors. Our result is catastrophes like the TV highway all over the metro area. We have "stroads" now: they are neither "streets" (where wealth accumulates in the form of locally based businesses and beautiful pedestrian-friendly environments) nor "roads" (which are designed to get people quickly from one neighborhood center to another). Our "stroads" are the "futons" of streets and roads. Futons are both bad couches AND bad beds. "Stroads" are what we have all throughout the metro area, and this policy needs to stop now! Our traffic engineers need to educate themselves with 21st-century thinking.

It is time to prioritize the use of funding for bicycling, pedestrians, carpoolers, and mass transit. Funds should be spent here first. To the extent connectivity projects improve these modes, widening streets (and highways? really? Haven't we done enough of that?) may be acceptable.

More emphasis should be put on improving non-car mobility.

Paving of all streets should be the top priority!

Safe, reliable, and connected are great, but other solutions should be prioritized for our scarce funding and rapid metro growth.

Tax payers money is much more needed in other city areas. This is a big waste of money to fund.

The emphasis should be on a reduction in the reliance on streets and highways.
There will have to be a strategic decision about whether focusing on walking and biking will really come to fruition, assuming a lot of money is poured into infrastructure, or not. If roads are widened, parking facilitated etc FOR cars, I don't see the biking/walking infrastructure happening.

This should be a state-wide priority not a metro priority.

Highways destroy life and should be ripped up not expanded and made even more "convient."

I don't support street widening in general.

I would like to see many of the unpaved roads paved in the east side before more roads are worked on and making it that much likely that the unpaved roads will get paved!

The current roadways should be sufficient. If we are focused on climate smart solutions we should focus our efforts on creating a greater infrastructure for neighborhood biking/walking/bus and improved intrastate travel (light rail, commuter trains) between WA and OR.

Again, we already pay for these. but Portland redirects our taxes to frivolous side projects. and keep spending more money on things that don't work...like the crosswalks on Beaverton Hillsdale that have flashing lights, but people still jaywalk.

Road building is a boondoggle that merely results in induced demand and the return of congestion. Widening of streets and highways should only follow investments in transportation options and the repair of currently damaged roads. If, as a region, we had built more highways instead of investing in MAX then we would have much wider highways and much worse congestion. Look at the numbers for the percentage of East/West commute trips that are taken on MAX. Now think of the economic and environmental costs of absorbing those trips on highways.

Streets are wide enough, potholes are good - they decrease speed.

Auto transit has received too much focus through the 20th century, I support road diets and restrictions where possible to encourage other means of transit, though the environmental impact of idling cars in stop and go traffic should be considered and somehow mitigated. Perhaps slower speeds but steadier flow is achievable.

I support making the money we already pay in taxes do what they should already be doing. I do not support asking for more money. There is already plenty in the pipeline.

In good repair yes, adding lanes to Highways or any new major road construction should be the lowest priority. It doesn't solve the climate crisis, on exacerbates it by encouraging more driving. Convenience in the short term should not out way the survival of our species, which really is what we are talking about.

Keep at current levels, increasing road size encourages more driving, I am ok with this as long as mass transit, biking and walking take the priority.

Let them perish.

More money needs to be put into public transit and a better cycling infrastructure instead of building more roads and encouraging people to commute by private car.
Would prefer to see money put into sidewalks, crossings, and bike crossings.

Any money spend on road widening is a giant waste of time and money. Usage patterns are already changing and demographic trends show a huge shift away from car trips and toward transit, active, and other alternative forms of transportation. Use the money for these things.

Connectivity is good, but simply widening streets does not really seem to impact traffic congestion.

I've never been a fan of adding lanes. Too often it seems to just "kick the can down the road", resulting in more congestion years or decades later.

Current level of funding seems adequate.

Street should be safe and well maintained. Widening of street makes them less safe and makes the use of alternate travel much harder. The cost of widening street is far to great for any perceived benefit.

What else can be done to reduce traffic to make the existing roads safe reliable.

Do so with the use of existing resources. There are adequate resources ("investments") presently, they may need to be reprioritized.

I'm afraid that any expansion/improvement of existing networks will merely promote their use, which is the opposite of promoting active transportation.

No. Use the funds you have. Stop taking more from the people.

Road system improvements should focus on major arterials that people need to get across town. Neighborhood streets should focus on non-car traffic.

Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits -Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles -Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit -Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life -Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals -Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency.

The more streets and highways you build, the more cars and congestion you will get. Invest in livable communities, not commuter corridors that choke us. My grandchildren cannot play on the street anymore because of all the cars that now drive down it.

This description is used to con people into putting more money into destructive roadway projects that mainly serve fossil fuel driven vehicles.

This looks suspiciously like an attempt to restrict parking.

We spend too much money on pavement. Increasing pavement is a long term money sink and a losing strategy. Figure out how to reduce this form of investment.
Widening streets does not make them more efficient. It attracts more traffic and congestion and allows drivers to drive less safe - more opportunities to cut people off and increase collisions. Widening the streets makes them less safe for pedestrians.

First, a plan centered around transit that works for the people (increased hours, service, reliability, access). Second, logical and thoughtful implementation of problem-solving. The CRC seemed crazy...the backup on I-5 coming south into Portland bottlenecks after the crossing, so how will widening the flow before that help anything? If the CRC would come with a highway business loop or something that allowed better flow of traffic around congestion points (i.e., a place to divert the extra traffic that would be possible with a CRC while clearing up local destination choke points) I'd be all for it. And there should be a light rail line on it.

Safe should start with well maintained roads... we do not need more neat looking signs and feel good government report items.

Widening streets and highways for cars simply encourages more auto trips. I think this is a bad idea.

I support keeping the roads in good repair but unilaterally widening roads will only increase usage.

I support the idea down to arterial level of streets but not beyond that. Make neighborhood and smaller streets more pedestrian friendly.

It is pointless to invest growth in a system that is not sustainable in our energy future.

It seems we are spending more time installing calming features in roadway to slow or divert traffic from smaller roads and arteries. If you want less congestion, get vehicles through traffic faster. There are many ways to increase speeds in major arterials. Just as there are many ways to reduce speeds on residential streets beside big bumps or hefty fines. Try allowing traffic engineers to develop solutions, not direct ideas from the political arena, or worse, from individuals whose job title is "planner" which requires any advanced degree including political science and outdoor sports activities.

Maintain road system; look for ways to improve connectivity; avoid widening of streets/highways. Need to reduce car traffic, not provide enhancements to car travel; we need to get serious about making it easy for folks to use something other than personal cars. Environmental pollution, addressing climate change are also key.

Maintain what we have. Reduce opportunities to widen/enhance roadways for single occupancy vehicles.

Raise the gas tax to make mass transit more affordable (either with direct subsidies from the increased revenue, or just due to increased cost of individual travel).

Safe and more capacity don't go together. Wider streets make less safety for people outside of cars the way we do it today.

Streets and highways are safe.

This is mostly an exercise in futility, widening highways beget more traffic. Focus more on public and active transportation networks or safe carpooling.
Yes if voted on by the public in area it is being considered.

A federally constructed dike can not be expanded without massive expenditure of tax money. I do believe in keeping our streets in good repair for the safety of all users, however, I could never support the widening of any roadways as I believe that it could only encourage the use of more automobiles when we should be working to get cars off of the roads.

I support making streets safer for all users, and road up-keep is paramount to keep things running. But widening and expanding the highway system through the region will detriment the community in the long run.

Repair only. your questions pre-suppose the answers you wish for, and limit the conversation.

The highway system has dominated public capital investment for over a century. Let's maintain what we have, but put most new investment in the necessary transition to much higher levels of walking, biking, and transit. Otherwise we'll just continue the metropolitan sprawl, plus help to destroy the climate.

I believe in investing in infrastructure, but I also believe that we are over-invested in automobile infrastructure. If one can invest in "streets" without making it easier for cars to exceed safe speeds, then I am in favor of that.

I support keeping our existing streets in good repair. The metro region should in no way consider widening any existing streets or building new highways. That will only add to car trips, poor air quality, and sprawl pressure on our region. Building more highways and widening existing ones is a massive waste of money.

Keeping the level of streets we have is fine. Building more streets doesn't fit problems, it just make the problem wider.

The need for greener commuting.

There should be a "no opinion" button above. Obviously all roadways should be maintained in safe, functional condition but I don't think additional capacity is warranted at this time. I would like to see the I-5 bridge over the Columbia replaced with new facilities — something a little less grandiose than the previous CRC design.

Use the road funds for the roads! Stop spending these funds for ANYTHING ELSE!

It sounds like you want to widen streets when really the focus is to have more through streets -- event paths would do it, but those are not even available.

Focus all new transportation projects to low-energy transportation (biking and walking).

I don't support more investment in making car travel easier except for getting around the region. Local roads need to be safe, but not necessarily more convenient. Neighborhoods need to give priority to pedestrians over cars. More stops and signals on local streets would encourage cars to take arterials designed for them. On neighborhood through roads (e.g., Division St.) parking should be limited to one side with a bike lane.
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Invest more in transit. Cars are the number one reason roads need repair. If we had less cars, we'd need less repair.

Lower priority than transit and biking/walking.

Road surfaces need to be upgraded everywhere. They're in terrible shape.

Streets are fine and dandy but I don't think we need more investment than we are already making in them. I am sort of glad when a neighborhood street is full of potholes because then I know the cars will go slower and I will not need to be as fearful for my life when I am walking.

Don't widen streets; there has been no solid evidence that widening streets decreases traffic congestion (unless I misunderstood Gordon Price)... Prioritize people on the ground before repaving.

I support the maintenance of the existing system, but not its expansion.

I would normally say this sounds good. Its not. Due again to retro fitting. We have been taking gas taxes out for yrs to spend on road maintenance. What on earth have you done with all this money? You have spent it on things we do not need. So the roads are now shot. Accountability is key here.

How many miles of unpaved roads are there in the Portland area? Yet the City of Portland gives $8 million to the Portland School District? Isn't the school levy supposed to cover the schools? Wouldn't $8 million be good to spend on roads? I have no confidence in government to do anything right in this regard! Sorry!

Minimal investment should be devoted to increasing capacity. History and other cities show we cannot build our way out of congestion. Maintain what is there and improve efficiency of existing roadways by improving intersections signalization, etc. the production of asphalt and concrete are huge greenhouse gas contributors. Bigger roads encourage more driving and more cars.

Unless the widening is to include more bike infrastructure and the connecting is to make neighborhoods more connected so that we can get rid of some of the huge arterials. Widening highways just encourages more driving and therefore more congestion.

It is good for the traffic is bears currently.

Safe yes, no to increasing capacity. Repair roads we have and don't start widening what we have or making new ones.

This is just another attempt to appease a small minority at public expense.

Honestly, I think roads are wide enough as it is. Making them wider will increase the number of cars on them and will increase the speed at which those cars travel, both of which should be avoided.
This is tricky. Studies show that bike-dedicated infrastructure encourages more people to bicycle. Studies also demonstrate SIN, "safety in numbers", where as the bicyclists and walkers increase, the number of collisions per cyclist/walker decreases. However, bike lanes are expansive infrastructure, and the safest lane position for cyclists is actually in the left tire track of the roadway lane, not bike lanes. Bike lanes are often created by transportation engineers not to provide safety, but as a way to keep cyclists out of the way of motorists so that motorists don't have to slow down. Bike lanes contribute to turning conflicts, allow cars to pass much closer, and often place cyclists too close to parked cars that may open doors... all of which contribute to fatalities. Obstructions on bike lanes are also common and rarely dealt with. Ideally, roadways would have plenty of bicycle markings encouraging cyclists to take the entire lane. MUTCD approved signage already exists: "Bikes may use full lane, change lanes to pass" and sharrows. Motorists should be educated to slow down in the presence of cyclists and pass only when safe to, as already is the law (ORS 811.100) and described in the drivers manual (page 83 of 2014-2015 manual). This represents the best combination of increasing safety, encouraging novice cyclists, and not having to lay more.

I selected no because yes/no was not an option... I think this policy conflates too many street classifications. Street connectivity at the local level discourages walking and biking because it makes it easy to drive short distances. Adding lanes does the same thing. That said, connectivity and efficiency at a larger scale makes sense from a GHG reduction and regional mobility standpoint. As written, this policy does not account for situations where targeted narrowing of streets may actually make them safer and more reliable (based on the emphasis in the examples). Consider separating policies for streets and highways. And remember, "Trying to solve congestion by adding more lanes is like trying to solve obesity by loosening your belt."

Our roads seem to be fixed more often then needed in Vancouver.

I do not universally support the widening of roadways as it signals to users that higher speeds are safer to utilize and I do not believe this leads to our region being safer or appealing.

I support safe and reliable streets, but not more streets. Preference should be given to expanding public transit modes.

I support safe roads but believe that active transportation and transit are higher priorities.

I would if the money that was collected for the repair and maintenance in the past was ACTUALLY used for that. Instead it went to the "Special Projects" those in power chose and road repair was ignored year after year. If more money was given... it would be the same thing. What guarantee do we have the money would go where it's supposed to?

If you build it, they will drive.

Millions of dollars are being spent on slicing seconds of of a commute when if fact the State could be delegating those dollars to local juristrictions for local use. The focus is on putting government workers back to work instead of spending the money wisely.
More attention should be put in encouraging public transit and connecting neighborhoods which is not done by putting in streets and highways.

Need to focus on the new technology that will improve travel without additional capacity.

Reduce stormwater runoff with narrower streets.

The road system should be kept in good repair but it is bad policy to widen streets and highways.

This is their responsibility! With huge resources budgeted for highway/street safety.

Too much to roads, too little to transit and bike.

When we DO have sidewalks in my neighborhood, they usually have a telephone pole right in the middle, effectively blocking wheelchairs, strollers, bikes, the blind... Drivers have enough options. Wanna go North-South on the East side? There's 140th, 122nd, 102nd, I-205, 82nd... A more modern vision and some traffic-funneling might be able to help. Ask commuters why they don't relocate or use TriMet. Maybe tap into outer communities (churches) to get people "on-board".

We've spent the last century making our streets/highways reliable and connected, if we are serious about climate change and livability we need to do the same with our walking, bicycling, and transit routes. Maybe at the expense of our highways and car-centric streets.

We've spent the last century making our streets and highways reliable and connected, if we are serious about climate change and livability then we need to do the same with our walking, bicycling and transit routes. Maybe at the expense of highway system and car-centric streets.

We need to depave not repave.

Too much to roads, too little to transit and bike.

There should be a de-emphasis of investment on carbon producing transportation.

The road system should be kept in good repair but it is bad policy to widen streets and highways.

Reduce stormwater runoff with narrower streets.

More is not needed. The same or a little less is fine. Encourage healthy forms of transportation.

Millions of dollars are being spent on slicing seconds of of a commute when if fact the State could be delegating those dollars to local jurastrictions for local use. The focus is on putting government workers back to work instead of spending the money wisely.

Investment in streets and highways should have two goals always in mind: implementation of Vision Zero policy (zero auto-caused fatalities are possible when safety is prioritized over every other consideration), and reduction of automotive traffic to only that which is absolutely necessary. The road network should be maintained, and strategically invested in, with an eye to a future which is completely different from the present. The past policies informing road and highway investment are based on flawed assumptions, and will not help to achieve stated goals of community health, climate standards, safety goals, and more. If there were a "maybe" or "conditionally" option, I would choose that over "yes" and "no".
I support safe streets, but not larger, wider streets - this would act to contradict the active transportation goals.

Bad roads slow people down, a good thing.

Yes or no not declared or zip code not provided

1 97004 Climate change means we should get away from motor vehicles so we do not need more highway capacity, but we do need more highway safety to share with bikes.

2 97007 We should, indeed MUST, reduce car traffic and travel--this very tired planet will not take much more.

3 97013 I have mixed emotions about this one. Yes I support more investment for streets & highways but there is a finite amount of money. Who/what is going to get it - transit, road/street maintenance, new road/streets??? My first priority is to maintain what we have, the split the balance between transit & new connections.

4 97034 This question has multiple parts that cannot all be answered Yes or No. First, maintaining the transportation system should be our highest priority for transportation funding. We need to maintain our investment. Second, widening streets and highways is a fools errand because widening roads creates demand. We should only add and widen roads in the places where it is critical to creating a missing connection.

5 97045 Needs of local communities.

6 97060 I suppose this is important, but I wouldn't want the widening of streets to ruin the beauty of our neighborhoods.

7 97080 Your heading in the wrong direction here! Freight and regional traffic needs alternative routes to avoid the inner-city congestion. I agree with keeping the roads in good repair but do not support the widening of many roads. Do we want to know as a city of roads and highways or efficient transportation systems that get our people to their destination with a smile?

8 97124 Prefer heavy investment in public transit to get people where they want to go. Try and advertising campaign about living close to work. Work on employers to allow employees to telecommute when possible, even one day per week would reduce traffic by 25%.

9 97201 Not sure if we should spend a lot of money on this.

10 97202 I support keeping the existing roads in good repair and well-connected. I worry that even "targeted" widenings can be abused, so I would say "maybe" to that part of question.

11 97202 No widening. Just repair and connections.

12 97202 Sure I support this - but do you want us to click yes to all of these topics? I would prioritize non-car transportation funding first, but recognize that roads must be safe for cares.

13 97206 Focus on the areas of need. Outer SE, unpaved roads, sidewalks etc.

14 97211 My answer is "yes" and "no." Safe, reliable: yes. Widening: no. We're not going to build our way out of congestion, and investing in other forms of transit is more cost-effective than building new lanes.

15 97211 Potholes and low maintenance translate no biking for me.
Special attention needs to be put to maintaining the safety and structural integrity of our bridges.

Keep roads in good repair, but limit amount of new roads being added.

Sustainable source of funding. Repair before adding new roads.

Roads should accommodate vehicle movement.

This is similar to asking if we are in favor of motherhood and apple pie; of course we want safe connected streets. The issue is cost and the question is what do we want at what cost. The cost of bringing unimproved streets up to city standards is beyond what many residents can do. You need to discuss funding options, otherwise this is just a way to justify increasing costs and saying "the voters asked for this."

Emergency uses of streets and highways.

I do not want to use "safety" as a code word for expansion. There is a double edged sword to road maintenance. The more we spend the more people want to drive. Money spent to make the roads "safe" for bikes is money being spent to encourage driving.

Widening and straightening highways and streets actually seems to encourage people to drive FASTER and pay less attention...sort of zoning out. I think we should make highways and streets more INTERESTING to drive on...and encourage looking around and driving not as fast.THAT would make them safer ... I also favor animal arcs over streets ..for squirrels and other animals to cross safely and cause less accidents.

I support about the same level of current investment. Maintenance of current roads

Make them safer by drastically reducing cars.

I support about the same level of current investment. Maintenance of current roads
4. Do you support more investment by your community and our region to use technology to actively manage the transportation system?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>Google already does this. Make it an app that people can use based on 'realtime.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7236</td>
<td>Ask the residents of these areas what they need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9730</td>
<td>Make traffic as smooth as possible, thereby saving fuel and man hours from being lost. This will help people and businesses the most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97002</td>
<td>Technology should be used to make traffic flow more efficiently, and priority should not be given to transit. Most people travel by car, too many policies are created to get people out of their car by making car travel less appealing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Ensuring that transit priority is not interrupting the already &quot;normal&quot; flow of traffic. Do not over build areas to support extra transit options when the existing road infrastructure is already pushed beyond its limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Rush hour traffic needs to move along at a steady pace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surfaces, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Adding blinking yellow lights at crosswalks that are hard for motorists to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Get the loonies off the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Give transit, bikes and pedestrians more priority at intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>How many red light cameras have to deceitfully shorten the yellow light to catch more drivers and give them expensive tickets, thereby sending thousands and thousands of dollars out of the community to elsewhere to justify the expensive technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>I think the $$ spent on travel time was a waste of money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Integrating systems between cities and counties. Washington County/Beaverton is a mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>New technology is essential to stretch resources and cut pollution buy if drivers continue mindless driving practices waste and pollution continues. Starting and stopping erodes pavement more than travelling at steady pace. Please go look at drivers (bus, private, business, fire trucks, police) throttle to and stop at--still red--traffic signal after signal. Who educates drivers to move in this manner? All the things related to transportation are tied to petroleum. What mindless drivers burn in engine to drive to lights adds fossil fuel exhaust to atmosphere and wears tires that grind pavement all of which precipitate or drain to the local watershed that drain to the ocean and become part of the tide. So salmon silently sip dinosaur soup as drivers mindlessly punch the throttle from one traffic signal to another. If fuel doubled in price they'd drive the same way. What education can be done to save the roads from mindless drivers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Our transportation priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Signal timing, responsive sensors (I'm a bike commuter and many intersections don't recognize me - I either run the red light or must wait for cars to approach in my lane.) Overall traffic management. Not sure new "commuter" digital signs are doing much - but maybe it will take some more time to see.

This should absolutely be pursued to mitigate the need to add more capacity. Alternative transportation should be an equal key focus of these improvements.

Use to better synchronize traffic signals. Reconsider the use of ramp signals.

What works? (The need for investment is largely self-evident).

All of the above listed in #4.

I don't like the sound of giving transit priority. Treat all road users equally. Identify and work to improve bottlenecks and trouble spots. Reevaluate signal times if necessary. Widen lanes if that still doesn't fix a problem spot.

I think i support this, but don't know enough to really be sure.

It depends upon what you mean by technology. If you mean timing stoplights (or using flashing yellow arrows) to keep traffic moving, then yes. If you mean signs on the freeways that tell how many minutes to the next exit, then no. I fail to see how the latter signs are useful.

Look at ways in which Europeans manage traffic. That includes restricting areas where cars and trucks can go. Low technology electric cargo cycles could do last mile shipments in certain areas, for instance.

Make technology really work to achieve these goals. Consider how technology can be used better. More red light cameras is overkill.

Most traffic lights seem to be ignorant towards bicycles. They don't detect us. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income to subsidize getting a better traffic signal system that also detects bicycles (and automatically give them and pedestrians priority of way over cars when it rains or freezes?). Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

Stoplights definitely need work. I like the flashing yellow left-turn arrows at some intersections in Beaverton.

synchronize traffic lights better reduce traffic times thus emissions & fuel use.

These measures save time on the road and thus reduce GHG emissions. They make transit more comfortable and pleasant for little relative cost.

Time lights so thru traffic on major streets keeps flowing. Time lights so getting in and out of residential areas takes longer. That way cut through drivers are less likely to fly through residential neighborhoods looking for short cuts (can you tell this is a pet peeve of mine?!!).
Transit doesn't need to have anymore priority than it already has. What needs to happen is far greater monitoring of the massive number of cyclists who chronically don't use any hand signals, don't stop at red lights/stop signs, weave in and out of lanes, etc. They are never held accountable by law enforcement so feel free to do whatever they want, since it is the motor vehicle driver who will, inevitably, end up being held responsible for anything that might go wrong. There's no accountability for either cyclists or pedestrians. It's unacceptable to only hold part of the public responsible for their actions on the road, instead of all!

Use tech to keep mass transit moving--one more thing to make transit desirable.

(no opinion)

A thousand times yes to all the suggestions above.

A very important policy.

Allowing for safety with all of these considerations.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

Connections across the region not just small little islands of tech.

Development needs to be focused around transit systems. Look to Europe, look to China.

Do not hinder traffic flow & safety with bicycle stuff that impedes, endangers, traffic flow by those who do not pay for the impediments.

Find technology that keeps motor traffic flowing efficiently, but also allows bikers and walkers to coexist with motor traffic safely.

Generally OK, BUT.NOT giving transit priority at intersections. Tricky that you should throw that in. Makes me think the whole survey is rigged. Eh?

Generally, there is very little coordination. During peak traffic periods, the entire coordination goes all to hell anyway. So, it seems to be a fools errand.

How does technology clear crashes and breakdowns quickly from roadways during high traffic volume times when many roads are parking lots? Don't cars and busses already have priority at intersections over pedestrians and those on bikes or skateboards. Traffic timing and pedestrian countdown signals (ADA required?), traffic calming in neighborhoods = all good.

I like the pedestrian countdown signs, but the new signs on 217 telling travel times seems redundant when my technology tells me how soon I'm likely to get to my destination given the traffic conditions.

Just do not do any more lights slowing traffic entering 217. What a mess it causes.

Like a smart power grid, transportation can benefit from traffic management systems that take full advantage of today's technology opportunities.

Make transit faster and cheaper than driving.
Oh, heck yeah, I think technology should be used to improve the transportation system! The stop lights are not synchronized (as far as I can tell) along Scholls Ferry Rd. west of Hwy-217. When a train blocks the road at 217 it takes many light cycles to clear up. Shouldn't the signals be lengthened after a blockage like that? Through Beaverton on Canyon and Farmington are a mess, too!

Smart lights for sure.

Without new road construction, technology will only moderately improve transportation congestion.

Yes. These technology improvements will continue to help us leverage the current system to it's capacity when possible. It has marginal help without some capacity increase since most surface streets are overloaded continuously.

You mention count-downs for pedestrians. A public information campaign, or signage, would be useful to inform pedestrians in Portland that they must not enter the crosswalk once the countdown stops NOT because they can't make the dash, but because cars needing to turn need time to do so before the next wave of pads. going the other way starts. Many people are not aware of this.

Accuracy in information. Current info displayed on highways are usually inaccurate. Not timely, poor information.

Good investment, but the new additions to the Intellegent network are too high end and the readerboards are a distraction and we waisted valuable $$. More of the older black & white boards could have been a better bang for the buck.

How this will help people get from Point A to Point B more quickly and safely.

I support the limited use of improved technology to reduce congestion, but it should be paired with congestion pricing schemes.

I think improvements already noted in Beaverton by allowing Flashing Yellow Lights at intersections for drivers has allowed ease of traffic congestion. This should be increased at more intersections whenever possible.

It appears we're instituting a lot of this in Portland Metro already (Yay!). A significant part of it is more effective education of drivers (and bicyclists and pedestrians) on traffic law and safe behavior (3 examples: 2-4 second follow distance, full-one lane pedestrian clearance vs. unrealistic full-street width clearance, OK to proceed at "eagle eyes" signals when clear and flashing red...).

No more variable message signs. A complete waste of money. Concentrate on coordinating signal timing.

Prompt repair of traffic signals that are not functioning.

The light timing on some roads in Beaverton are completely off. This creates too much back up on the roads.

Transit, bikes, and peds should definitely have priority. Countdown signals are very helpful.
Approach the design of such a system from an area-wide perspective, rather than having to add such considerations later. For instance, consider the entire I-5 and I-84 corridors in Oregon and build "ahead" of the need rather than playing catch-up later.

Coordinate lights on main streets.

Enhancing road traffic and making it safe benefits my local community.

everything sounds good on this policy EXCEPT giving transit priority at intersections-they can wait there turn like everyone else.

Investing in technology has the potential to lessen the need for more infrastructure, making it a highly cost effective use of resources.

Cost vs benefit.

This is a good use of the limited funding for transportation projects. While still expensive, it is a lot cheaper way to keep traffic moving than building new infrastructure.

Safety.

Study what California does as I have found their traffic signal timing to be incredibly efficient.

The less you make cars stop and start, the less they pollute, so keeping them in motion is best for us all.

Yes, if it will help auto traffic flow more smoothly. No, if you're just talking about public transit.

Better traffic flow management with stop lights. There are many roads and thoroughfares where traffic stops at every light and slows down because of it. Also, add more variable yellow light signals in Portland.

Updating technology in all possible locations at regular intervals.

Your suggestions look good.

This is among the most cost effective and best system approaches to optimize existing capacity.

Unsure.

Depends on the specific benefits and costs.

Digital technology is the only way to coordinate a comprehensive trans system.

Don't make technology the end all; computers fail, are programmed wrong, hackers can access it, etc. make sure to have logical back ups.

Give bikes more priority at crossings and lights, like all way stops at intersections for bikes to cross.

Plan carefully and keep costs in check.

Tech. people can make this happen.

Timing traffic signals is so important for flow as well as frustration.

All of the technological innovations I have seen in this region work well and should be expanded to improve the efficiency of the overcrowded arterials we are stuck with.

Focus as little as possible on automobiles except in terms of slowing them down to protect pedestrians and bicyclists. Pedestrians, bicyclists, and buses should be given priority #1.
90 97034 Great idea in concept.
91 97034 I don't support additional funding in this area, but I do support reprogramming existing transportation funds into this area. In fact, after maintenance, this is should be the highest priority for transportation funding.
92 97034 If it really means something. If there aren't meaningful alternatives the it is just window dressing.
93 97034 Nearest parking location, ride share (like Uber) should both be considered.
94 97034 Please, please, please.
95 97034 Population growth projections.
96 97034 Sorely needed, ODOT and the local/state police departments do a miserable job of clearing crashes. Keeping the roads maintained in better shape would help efficiency and gas mileage and emissions.
97 97034 The clearing up crashes etc from roadways is a must!!! I am from a Midwest state that in general pales in comparison to the great state of Oregon. However you rarely sit anytime at all after a crash as the mess is moved fast out of the way and traffic doesn't have a chance to back up for hours. Another reason we need less cars and more RELIABLE daily transportation.
98 97034 The flashing yellow left turn lights are awesome! Please consider technology that senses when people at intersections have made a right turn on red, so that the lights do not turn to let them go...they're already gone and cross traffic sits and waits for a light.
99 97034 Timing traffic signals on major arterials could do more to reduce the the use of fuel and emissions when thousands if not millions of cars idle at traffic signals when they should be moving seamlessly through intersections. Example: There are five traffic lights between Boones Ferry and I-5 on Kruse Parkway. Assuming you are driving at the speed limit it is almost impossible to drive from one end to the other without stopping and not unusual to be stopped at each light.
100 97034 Use ramp metering (ideally using prices, not red and green lights) to prevent the interstate system from EVER exceeding capacity. At certain times of day, the Banfield is a parking lot and has less effective capacity than my driveway; this is insane.
101 97034 Use test sites and cases before implementation.
102 97034 Using available and emerging technologies to increase efficiency. Logic should prevail with sound back-up plans for technology failures.
103 97034 We want a more efficient system but we don't want more & more cars on the road. we need more public transport paid with taxes on individual car transportation.
104 97034 Within reason.
105 97035 Although this is not to slight crime investigations after crashes.
106 97035 Encourage and provide funding for smaller communities that do not have the immediate need for upgraded systems. Create a localized "trip-check" website/program hosted by PBOT?
I try to stay current on road constructions projects around me, but don't remember seeing specific section for updates stating technology improvements. It would be helpful/interesting to know how technology helps us keep moving around smoothly.

Increase capacity.

Something that will reduce vehicles sitting and waiting and thus polluting and wasting fuel resources.

Sure, why not?

Would be nice to have traffic be able to flow smoother.

Very cost effective way to increase capacity.

All of the above works if and when people follow rules. that is the problem. Running red lights like four cars after a red? Peds who use the walk sign and get with it not talk on phone or saunter. Police parking so much in the roadway at accident. A bus that can't pull over (see that plenty and they have room) How much does common sense cost???

As long as it makes sense.

Better coordination of stoplights to reduce idle time of vehicles stopped at intersections.

Big picture thinking - why can't the signals during peak hours be better synchronized so you can make every signal if you just keep at the posted speed limit. And watch those U-turns - folks are making U-turns at the oddest places and against solid yellow lines and sometimes in the face of oncoming traffic who is following a green arrow or light. Anticipate U-turn issues and fix them. And if you do roundabouts make the signage work! Roundabouts are confusing enough on their own, at least make the streets coming off them well-marked. LOVE THE COUNTDOWN pedestrian signs!!! So helpful to me as a driver to know if I can clear the intersection in time if there is a lot of traffic or if I should stop.

Cost.

Definitely we can't have buses parking in the middle of the street if there's a possibility they can pull over slightly (when stopping for loading/unloading). Also clearing minor accidents faster would help. Timing really helps. Also the flashing yellow (left turn) on red is good but some places need more fine tuning.

Having yellow arrow turn lights has been a nice addition. Continue to come up with innovative ways like the above.

I think timed signals and countdown signs are excellent, as are the flashing yellow left-turn yield additions, which have significantly improved traffic at several key intersections on my commute. I'm not as big a fan on giving transit priority at intersections.

Of course use new technology. Should be grants available to convert where needed.

Protection of the system from unauthorized access, hacking. Protect privacy.

Reduce this insane growth --- this will better control the traffic problems.
Support some aspects of it. Not all.

This is helpful for those of us on the edges of the UGB.

This makes workers same time and gas when traveling to their jobs.

Transit should not have priority. Riders of transit are not paying for that privilege.

Use of smart signals that can sense when there is a gap in traffic flow so turn signals can take advantage of the gaps.

Using technology is important but it is of equal importance to as just related to common sense. When we have affordable opportunities to use technology - yes, but just going out and tuning things that can be done to reduce the negative effects of bottlenecks can have a greater return. Studies point out that when turbulence can be eliminated traffic flows and more vehicles get thru the same are in the same time period.

What other communities in the US are doing.

Yes please!

Use technology to improve not to punish and harass.

Prioritize best investment for dollars spent.

Target most effective investment first.

THE MORE SMOOTHLY THE TRAFFIC FLOWS, THE LESS FUEL USED AND THEREFORE LESS EMMISIONS.

High importance - keep the traffic moving smoothly.

That is important just to control the flow.

Another poorly framed question. Using technology is already part of the equation in managing the transportation system, and this is a no brainer. However giving transit priority is already the norm, and the roadblocks that the busses already make outside of the traffic signals would not be eliminated through traffic signals.

Combine it with local community needs. One size does not fit all.

Control cost for new technology.

Costs (of course) but also prioritize based on need and history and planned or unplanned growth.

Efficiency.

How can various agencies collaborate so the policy will be the most efficient?

How easy it will be to implement the technology.
I am ALL OVER traffic signal timing! I grew up/went to school in San Jose, CA, where, if you were doing 23 mph (and the traffic lights all had signs on them telling you this) one could cruise the length or breadth of downtown without EVER stopping for a light (OK, not at rush hour, but most any, other time). What a fuel savings! What a STROKE saver! Now, the "activity-activated" lights ENCOURAGE drivers to RACE forward to the next signal, knowing that the sooner someone passes over the imbedded (or overhead) sensor, the sooner the (&@# red light will turn green. Then on to the next, etc. I'd (grudgingly, since transit does not serve my neighborhood, and never will) give transit priority, but signal timing would be a higher priority for me. And some of the recent (this last two weeks) accident clearings were just STUPID! Except for an overturned log truck or semi-trailer, WHY would most or all of an Interstate need to be closed for several hours (of course, not counting a vice-president's visit). The back-ups from these bred their own casualties though (fortunately) usually only fender-benders (but not always!).

No to giving transit priority at intersections.

This is the lowest cost alternative that can provide significant impact to the efficiency of existing roadway systems.

Time the lights. when speed limits change, lights needs to be changed to reflect the change.

Traffic signal timing is important. But instead of the new signs guessing at how many minutes from point A to B, how about fluctuating speed limits for safe travel? And the speed limit should be the same for semis and other vehicles. It's insane to have cars trying to zip around slow-moving rigs on the freeway.

Duh! And oh by the way the ITS system on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd is making ZERO difference. The expensive signs on the freeways that tell me how long it will take to get to the other end do not increase the flow of traffic. This could be news to you.

I think you have it covered - timed signals, and all the rest.

Intelligent traffic light management systems to match traffic patterns.

None other than that I'm ok giving the ability to public transit trains and busses to interrupt trip traffic signal cycles (i.e. turn signals red for cross traffic) and continue moving. Also, and I'm only half joking that there are some intersections of local streets where I believe pedestrians should have perpetual crossing ability and if a driver wants to continue, he or she must stop, trip a magnetic loop detector or traffic camera or roll down the window and press a button, in order to get pedestrian traffic to stop and get a green light. This would work where swarms of pedestrians often overwhelm vehicles.

Only if it has to do with road management.

See the preceding. Traffic flow needs to be efficient, bike lanes need to not disappear at intersections or where roads narrow, and timed lights would be wonderful. Of course, pedestrians need to be protected.

Smart technology decisions as they develop and can be implemented to help make transit more smooth over all.
This is a mixed message question.... transit priority, cleaning crashes, and permanent signals all only relate slightly.

Traffic flow both within the cities and not just for I-5.

A lot of efficiencies can be attained with technology to reroute traffic around chokepoints, prevent unnecessary waits and buildups at stop lights.

Anything that causes cars and trucks to move more efficiently and quickly will do the most to cut greenhouse gases.

Better light timing to move traffic would be nice.

But only if it helps cars move more smoothly and quickly.

But this does not include so called traffic information signage that has been installed on various freeways and interstates around the area. Timing traffic signals is a huge item that should be implemented.

Cooperation of local residents and police. Paranoid Luddites will not appreciate technological approaches. There's also smart people management—a cop parked on a freeway unnecessarily creates a traffic jam as drivers slow down.

Educate drivers on better road usage rules; including bikers and motorcyclists; the idiots on the roads cause most of the issues.

Especially traffic signals. I hate driving in downtown Portland in the afternoon lurching from traffic light to red traffic light! The technology has been available for decades to have smooth running traffic signals which are timed correctly. Portland's signals just seem to be willy-nilly and are probably controlled by pedestrians wishing to cross.

If cities would set the traffic control systems to move vehicles better and not a fund raising system through photo radar, accidents would be less and traffic moves better.

Implement proving technology with accountability back to procurement and supplier.

In theory, but those new signs on the freeways just slow everybody down to read them, so that was a total waste.

Integrate the system so that I can be read by navigation software more easily. In this way, drivers can navigate more efficiently, saving gasoline.

Safety and efficiency.

Safety and traffic flow are significantly increased with proper signaling and signage.

The region should use new technologies that support reducing fatalities and serious injuries. Connecting car to car and car to facilities is a great start.

This topic has the potential to provide the most benefit.

Timing traffic signals is probably the most important, especially in areas of serial lights.
Utilize easy to implement technology systems. Assure that community knows about them and their ability to help traffic & pedestrians.

Absolutely #1 out of your 7 topics.

Again, "investment" doesn't necessarily mean throwing money at the problem. We can and do already time traffic signals, should be better managed. Giving transit priority at intersections shouldn't cost more than publishing/disseminating the information to the public (adding to vehicle code?) However, if transit blocks intersections, that would only contribute to traffic problems and accidents.

Although not in ways that reinforce continued status quo of roads having primary emphasis rather than secondary or tertiary importance. Don't make it easier to keep them because of the technology invested. Start eliminating and rethinking/rerouting vehicle rightofways before investing in more technology.

Any opportunities to reduce idling and improve safety of all users should be priorities.

Fix the I-5/217 "flying bridge" off-ramp.

One of the most practical and minimal cost effective changes being implemented is the flashing left-turn arrows at signalized intersections. These are far more effective than the more elaborate and expensive freeway sign panels and variable lane speed signs, which are pretty much worthless.

Put HOV fast lanes on I-5 south of Lake Oswego, incorporating a toll option, as used along the Wasatch Front between Ogden and Provo, Utah, The revenue could be used to widen Boone Bridge.

Technology is awesome!!!

Technology might also help manage peak traffic - perhaps there is an HOV lane active only during peak commutes. During off peak it is any occupancy.

Use the least needed to fulfill a need while balancing growth in an area. The Tualatin/Sherwood exit is adding a new lane for the exit, but is the entrance to the freeway able to change timing in response to not just the day or time, but the traffic flow. Why allow more cars on an already backed up freeway?

When the pedestrian walk sign is lite, do not start traffic flowing until the sign goes out.

I would not support giving transit priority at intersections.

I'd like to see the lights timed. I don't understand why I can drive well over or under the speed limit on TV Highway and make lights but not if I drive the speed limit exactly.

More blinking yellow lights.

This policy is a must and should be considered first.

Using GPS to allow riders real time information about their trip.

As in anything regarding technology, it all depends on the details and the implementation. No simple answers, but remember COVER OREGON.
195 97080  Ask commuters to volunteer / opt in / to a smart phone app that tracks their morning commute, and generates big data to be used to optimize traffic signaling across the Metro region. If enough drivers allow Google / Metro to track their start and stop times, I would suspect that the traffic planners could do a better job.

196 97080  Better east-west traffic FLOW east of 205. Morning and evening commuters should NOT have to stop at every stop light heading east and west. Time the lights, and make pullouts for the busses. Don't have a bus stop every block, or if you do, only stop there half the times. DONT LET CROSSWALKS RULE ROADS.

197 97080  Check out what other cities are doing around the world. Ask our technology leaders to make Portland a pilot city for their programs. Be on the cutting edge. This will help stimulate our city as one of the top innovative places to live!

198 97080  Giving transit priority at intersections seems counterproductive. By making cars, bikes, walkers wait while a MAX train with two riders in it goes by (this happens frequently at all non-rush hour times) is a bad idea.

199 97080  Improving traffic flow, rather than causing cars/trucks to brake, idle at stop lights, and otherwise waste fuel. I suspect governments want wasted fuel to increase fuel tax revenues, though they would never admit it publicly.

200 97080  Light timing is always appreciated.

201 97080  LOVE the blinking yellow lights! More of these, please. Also, I like the strobe crossing signals to let motorists know that pedestrians want to cross.

202 97080  Maintain flow of vehicle traffic.

203 97080  No more out-of-control technology spending with nothing to show for it.

204 97080  Start with the busy roads and work down.

205 97080  Usage and Safety should be the top concerns and finding what works and what doesn't from other areas in the country.

206 97080  Where does pedestrian safety need to be improved.

207 97086  Cost benefit analysis do this before adding new lanes

208 97086  Do not give transit priority at intersections. What about transportation equity.

209 97086  It would be nice to have signals that respond to traffic so we don't all sit and wait when no one is coming. Also, allow walk all ways while all traffic waits so when we do get a green light we don't have to wait for pedestrians.

210 97086  N/A

211 97086  The less cars have to sit idle, the better. "Bike only" crossing signals on very busy roads would make it a lot more safe to travel on bikes. The one at Bell Ave and Johnson Creek Rd is a perfect example.
Transit priority at intersections is important. Why take a bus when it is slower? Consider dedicated transit lanes—such as the stretch of SE 82nd St.—that allow buses to move unimpeded by traffic congestion. I have ridden this and am impressed by its effectiveness.

Yes, but only to the extent to which it keeps people off the roads in the first place, as I mentioned in the last comment.

A system in which technological developments can be easily updated as time goes on would be ideal.

I main concern is what happens when the power is out, if we become too dependent on technology.

Signals could definitely be timed better. In our area, they keep adding lights which slows down the majority of the traffic flow and causes more exhaust gases.

Using solar or other renewable energy sources. Using the best technology available.

Sure time the lights, but also lower speed limits and put in employ taming, eg speed bumps, and do weever you need to to reduce crashes.

Look at how well Seattle has implemented technology and follow suit. ODOT is making strides in this area.

Not a high priority compared to areas.

Using technology makes perfect sense.

First street northbound in Hillsboro has the worst-timed lights in the area. It is ridiculous to have to stop for every light.

Only include and implement proven technologies and methodologies. No pet projects and fly-by-night ideas.

power these technologies with clean energy. That does not include sources from hydro!

Advances in this area have been positive and helpful. Continue to implement where feasible.

Don’t set aside lanes for HOVs. We all pay taxes so we all should be able to use all lanes.

Having lived in an area where traffic signals were timed to increase traffic flow, that seems to be a fairly easy and less expensive place to start and does an incredible job of moving traffic along. Start with the less expensive stuff first.

I want to be cautious about cameras though, they are, to me, the two sided sword, open for future abuse.

IT can also create safety problems so implement carefully. Money for technology should not be prioritized over better road maintenance and construction of needed highways.

Keep up the good work!

Make driving safer and better managed is a goal that will improve life for the majority of the population.

Reducing idling time important. Also, countdown for pedestrians at traffic signals is important.

Timing of signal lights. Side streets should not activate signal lights on major collectors by just one car.

yes, however the use of programmable speed limit signs should be removed, the rate of travel should not be restricted unnecessarily.

Find the most gridlocked areas and solve those problems first, then expand to other areas.
I have appreciated the recent digital transit time reader boards on the freeways. Implement coordinated traffic signal systems along the most heavily congested corridors first. Prioritize to put the projects with the most impact (highest throughput) first.

Implementing 20% of the available computing power and brain power into managing traffic lights and traffic will probably have an 80% decrease in congestion, frustration and GHG emissions.

More patrol on highways.

The technology is there and we have so many technology experts in Washington County and other parts of Oregon. We should be the leader in this.

These are great ideas. Also, barriers to walk across Max tracks.

This is a must! If you need any examples of a horribly designed road, visit 10th Street in Hillsboro, going south between Cornell and TV. That light timing is so bad there are times you can walk that section faster than drive.

Traffic flow on all streets, not just major thoroughfares.

Transit already has priority at intersections. Don't punish drivers for not choosing transit.

Whatever technology is or becomes available to make the streets safer and easier to use for all residents.

Would also like to see better, more pedestrian-friendly crossing signals. Why do pedestrians have to get to the intersection before the light turns green? If we don't push the button before the corresponding traffic light turns green, we have to sit there and wait through two green lights. Additionally, if two people are walking on opposite sides of the street they both have to press the walk button to get green lights. I'd love to see drivers have to put up with the same thing - pressing buttons, getting splashed by cars flying by.

A ton of gas is wasted, much emissions generated, by starting and stopping at every light, when traffic is LIGHT. We have better technology than what is being used to control traffic lights.

Absolutely support this option. Determine areas in most need of better management and concentrate on those first.

Consolidation of services, cost of implementation.

Cost/effectiveness of systems uniform systems for managing long term.

Do not reinvent the wheel. See what is already available and in use elsewhere and use the same thing here.

Evaluate where needs exist. Need to monitor what's successful.

High benefit cost returns for these types of investments.

How about timing traffic lights so that I have enough time to ride through the intersection before opposing traffic gets the green.

I support this policy as long as there is a backup system in place in case of technology malfunction.

I think that it is important to prioritize those traveling by foot, bike, or transit. If we make cars the number one priority, it just encourages more cars which will not fix traffic or pollution issues!
Improving traffic timing signals is greatly needed on the westside of Portland, especially TV Highway.

Keep it simple and adjustable. Example all merge signals should change with traffic condition rather than just at set times.

Leave crashes and breakdown in place longer so more people can witness the dangers that are out there.

Limited. The entrance ramp lighting is only useful in moderate traffic, not heavy nor light traffic. Pretty expensive, it would seem. Improving road conditions and targeted lane additions makes sense.

See earlier comments about using technology for more on-demand transit frequency and giving lower priority to driver convenience. But countdown signs are great for drivers too.

This is very important because this does work!

This might be my favorite. The "Internet of things": When our technological creations utilize big data to make our lives as efficient as possible. Given innovation and technological advancement, we are reaching the point where speed and quality need not be mutually exclusive objectives.

Time traffic signals to enhance gas mileage.

Timing traffic signals will have the most positive impact at what I believe should be the lowest cost. Pedestrian count down signals are cute, but I don’t think they help that much.

Timing traffic signals. Rush hour traffic, some signals need to be longer during rush hour.

Traffic control measures developed to maintain a safe and orderly flow of traffic are critical to this objective.

Traffic signals often don’t match up, leading to more use of gas.

TV Highway is horrible when it comes to traffic signal timing.

I really like the new "travel time" signs, but highway safety needs to be a higher priority. Dr. Fritz’ death was a tragedy that could have been avoided if the safety improvements had been made in a timely way.

Don’t give transit priority at intersections.

Absolutely allow peds and cyclists safe areas first.

I doubt Metro has any money left over from the horrendously expensive and wasteful light rail systems.

I would love to see mass transit given the priority at lights, I make the trip on the bus on highway 99W frequently and if light timing helped the bus move more efficiently I would be very supportive. The pedestrian countdown signs are very useful, I do believe that there is currently confusion of how the signaling is to be used. Whether is the flashing hand and timer mean "do not start crossing" or "you have this much time complete the crossing" a clarifying statement of the way currently in place for the signals would be very helpful.

Nothing like sitting in a turn lane waiting for the light to change when there is no traffic coming from any direction. Technology could speed up traffic flow immensely.

Please be aware of the aging of our majority and allow ample crossing time for pedestrians.
Technology is only as good as those providing the service. Question technology that is managed from a long distance or out of state.

That's a difficult definitive yes. Again it's broad. We also need to get back to a focus not just on ideal vehicle traffic flow, but also reasonable pedestrian flow. With the aging of our society, most of the pedestrian signals I have encountered throughout the metro area do not allow reasonable time for the average, let alone the slower, pedestrians to cross at signals. The countdowns don't help if the timing is impossible. When bicyclists can't even cross within the timed crossing limit, how can a pedestrian begin to hope to cross? So, I think as much consideration needs to put into the flow of pedestrians as is put into the flow of cars.

Timing of lights to increase traffic flow only.

Timing traffic signals! YES! It is difficult to clear crashes. Examination needs to take place which takes time. Rally like pedestrian count down signs. Public transit already has preference at most intersections.

We need to make sure the informational signage is current. A couple of weeks ago on 217 the sign said crash ahead 2 miles for 3 days. So traffic would slow and no crash. Need good monitoring.

Changes in this area should pay their way.

Effectiveness.

How fast it can be implemented. The sooner the better.

I don't know!

I love the signs on the freeway that explain the cause of slow-downs, as well as how long it will take to get places. They are nice, but not essential.

I think there should also be a policy for reviewing the number and severity of traffic collisions in intersections and once it reaches a threshold, there needs to be a change implemented to improve the safety of that intersection. Whether it be a two way stop or two five lane streets crossing each other.

I think this is obvious if you want an effective mass transit system using a variety of vehicles.

I wish there were an option to say "don't know" because I really don't know how much these things make a difference. I'd base it on best evidence about what really works.

Innovation and new ideas about getting traffic, mass transit, bikes and pedestrians moving continuously without stopping every block and interfering with each other would be safer, faster and could be made esthetically better and greener.

Installing infrastructure for safe pedestrian crossing NEEDS TO BE A PRIORITY. Especially in East Portland.

Look at other cities and learn from them. Don't be the Beta site for an unproven technology.

Make separate lanes for busses and taxis like they have in Berlin and other cities.

MAX could use better handling of 'breakdowns'. When one train is stopped on the red/blue line, the whole 40 miles of track is stopped.

Reducing congestion, pollution, and fatalities.
SF is making smart use of technology to minimize the amount of time people circle around looking for parking and to charge variable (market) rates for parking. Technology could be the key to controlling and limiting auto traffic.

Step by step.

Supply a very visible and convenient mechanism to collect and address feedback of problem with this technology. Implement all of these technologies cautiously to reduce risk of distrust. Test, test, test.

The more up to date, the better.
The pedestrian countdown signs and prioritizing public transit are excellent ideas.

They called it the "green wave" when I lived in Europe. Bring it on! Downtown is not too bad, but frankly the outlying suburbs are the awful (Beaverton, Hillsboro), although perhaps not a target of this survey.

Thoughtful use of cameras—only where really needed. Otherwise it is invasion of people's privacy.

We already do this better than many cities, but can still do more.

Why can't Portland have the flashing yellow turn lights that Beaverton has? That helps move traffic.

An accurate tracking system will increase ridership on public transit.

better and easier and probably cheaper than improved roadways. Let tech do the work and it should flow better.

better pedestrian signals, transit priority at intersections, transit dedicated lanes. Higher density mixed use development to reduce the need for commuting.

But don't introduce technology for its own sake—consider how useful and affordable innovations are.

But, boy, you could easily overdo it. Keep it simple.

Can political pressure be exerted on Union Pacific to get them to stop irresponsibly blocking roads. They shouldn't be allowed to just park in town, stopping all traffic.

Cost and equity. This is a lower-priority than making infrastructure safer and more robust in communities with lower incomes.

Cost efficiency - go for the biggest returns first.

Cost to build and cost to maintain. Find reliable companies to implement the technology, better yet find local companies that understand the product they are developing a solution for.

Cost/benefit analysis of proposed projects.

Don't buy software from sketchy companies like other government agencies have. I'm not being facetious; I'm too familiar with this.

Downtown congestion should be targeted too via variable rate parking fees based on demand.

Each technology should be evaluated on a case by case basis. I would rather have more protected bike lanes before most any other type of technology.

Electronic tolling for Clackamas County commuters on the new Sellwood bridge.
Emphasis on using technology to improve bike/ped/mass transit. Especially giving transit priority. Especially giving transit priority, and better pedestrian signs. Except for a few areas (E.G. McLoughlin north bound), there seems to be little use of modern technology. One would think in this day that advanced systems and software is available for a more efficient flow of mass transit, autos and pedestrians. Facilitate expediency. Fine, as long as vehicles get priority over the soon to be bankrupt trimet. I do like timed signals as it does make it easier to get places esp on busy streets. I do NOT like priority to transit systems as buses do tend to clog up the streets at times...the new pull outs put on certain streets, they do not use. And there are Tri Met drivers who do not know that they should not be crossing the middle line. On Division now, most of the buses tend to be over their line which causes slow downs on the opposite lane. They just think they don't have the space but they do. And if not, then someone in the City goofed on the measuring of the lanes.

I know very little about this technology, but in general smarter is better. I lived in a town that had timed lights and residents understood that the speed limit listeriosis the key to getting down the heavily traveled corridor. This ensures steady movement of traffic, safe speeds, and reduced pollution and fuel use. I think helping residents to understand the benefits will allow for a universal understanding of how to use it. It only takes one driver to mess it all up.

I support this in theory but would need to know more details on what exactly this means. I support a greener, safer, and accessible transportation system so in as much as technology improves that - great! It is clear to me that technology can help with what is a very challenging problem. I would like more attention to be focused on how to eliminate unnecessary starting and stopping, and I would like to see proper roundabouts replacing many traffic signals. Roundabouts work really well in Europe with yield signs. Why are our larger roundabouts crippled with stop signs? This is not sane.

Less important than other policies. Love this idea. Lower priority than maintaining safe roads and ensuring access for peds, bikers, and affordable mass-transit. Lower priority than other things. Make sure that pedestrians and bicyclists are safe, and that transit is given preference to single occupant vehicles when that choice must be made. Make sure the technology is thoroughly tested and working before implementation.

Minor gain. Getting people out of cars onto transit should be first priority. Transit, bikes, peds all have priority over a single passenger car.
More infrastructure for bikes.
NO buy-the-mile tax systems, no red light cameras.
Not a top priority though.
Of course. Use technology. Does this include making sure that smart phone applications that show traffic information is accurate? I know that I use those aps and adjust my driving based on the information on Goggle Maps.

Places with most congestion and pollution, especially in close proximity to residential areas.
Please time the traffic lights.
Present system seems ok but aware of increased traffic causing more slowdowns.
Prioritize crosswalks that need more attention by vehicles- lights, sounds, pedestrian activated.
Proper placement of improvements where they would seem to do the most good.
prudent investments.
Real time dynamic speed control signs such as in Europe on major arterials and freeways can help. Improved IT solutions for transit fare payments welcome.
Redirect money from bike infrastructure.
Signal timing improvements are always welcome (thanks for the changes at the 12th street I-84 overpass). Congestion pricing is sweet. Giving busses, bikes extra lead times at intersections is OK, better if we implement BRT. A better and cheaper solution would be implementing the "Idaho Stop" law.
Smarter traffic signals that use a vision system to recognize that flow has greatly reduced from one direction, and thus can switch the signal to let cross-traffic start moving. Also, more enforcement of red-light running would be welcome. I have noticed an increase in the number of vehicles going through on red along Powell Blvd, and on Tualatin-Sherwood Rd.

Some of the new bike signals work quite well. We need more signals for pedestrian crossings.
Support this for improvements to transit.
Supporting current transportation system rather than trying to reinvent the wheel.
Sure, if it will be reliable. Flaky "Transit Trackers" and such, damage public faith and willingness to use public transit.
Sure. But reducing regional VMT (not just per person VMT) would be a better way to make traffic run more smoothly. Get people out of cars unless there's no other reasonable option.
Technology is not going to be enough, need to focus on other investments.
Technology that encourages modes besides cars is part and parcel with other equitable investments.
The technology should be chosen carefully and have a good track record so we don't suffer technology breakdowns. Operators should be trained to deal with breakdowns.
This is very effective when used well.
Use by electric bicycles parking provisions more informational highway signs indicating congestion ahead.

We just got a TIGER grant for this, so let's use it wisely. A big piece of this technology puzzle is ENFORCEMENT. All road users need to follow the existing laws and there needs to be automated enforcement used to make sure people use the roads safely and responsibly.

We should emphasize giving pedestrians and bicyclists priority through our technology at intersections. This also helps boost safety of vulnerable road users.

Work with The Climate Trust on this one. I don't have contacts any more but I was a board mbr for 5 yrs.

Would be nice to see better clean up when crashes occur.

Yes, all the ideas mentioned are good ideas.

Yes, makes sense. Signals can now sense when drivers are going faster than the speed limit, and turn red. When the driver slows, the light turns green again. Let's have signals that give peds and bikes priority!

Access to technology is often lacking for groups that need public transit the most.

All of these benefits sound amazing and very important.

As long as it's used by people with at least as much common sense as degrees - a degree does not, alas, always relate to practicality. Witness a lot of traffic calming devices which serve to increase air pollution, by removing right turning lanes.

I love smart intersections that are programmed to be efficient, and operate based on actual need as much as possible.

Include automated signals that advise motorists to turn off motors at stoplights as is done in many European and Australian cities. Just needs to become a habit.

Leverage tools to improve transit performance and improve driver behavior.

Lights with sensors, turn lanes.

Low cost high return.

So long as these are primarily aimed and incentivizing non-auto transportation.

The technology should be proven effective elsewhere before PDX buys into it. We can no longer afford to be the guinea pig for the next shiny thing. Use domino budgeting: the savings from LED streetlights can be used to improve signal and speed limit management. Possibly encourage drivers to obtain and use GPS that are smart about routing around delays, etc.

Very smart.

Want to make sure that investment in this category does balance active management which supports transit and active transportation and isn't solely focused on actively managing vehicle throughput.

Yes please.

Establishing technology competency within transportation agencies. It appears that agencies like ODOT and PBOT lack the initiative to use technology.
Timed lights for sure and perhaps pedestrian only crossing signals, as they do in some larger cities, to cut down on pedestrian injuries and deaths.

Timing traffic signals so that we stop less at lights and burn/waste less fuel has been proven to work in other cities. ie: there are fewer accidents and commutes are shortened. Clearing crashes quickly would be fantastic, though I've yet to see an accident that officers/troopers didn't think required all but one lane to be closed!

Continue to use technology to make choosing alternative options easier.

Cost effective methods that are already proven to work.

Design in transportation management system to take in consideration technological changes in autos and buses, and trucks including 'self-driving' vehicles and the development of vehicle movement monitoring systems which can adjust traffic to conditions and maintain effect movement. A higher priority and planning for traffic flows in relation to construction projects.

I love the way lights in downtown Portland are timed for bikes rather than cars--more of this!

Make it easier for peds, bikes, and transit to move about town. Personal vehicles should not have priority. Can we actually have lights that respond to ped 'beg buttons' instead of still making peds wait, wait, wait. (This delay is a leading cause of ped injuries due to ped impatience at crossing.) And there are so many lights in town that still do not trigger for bikes!

More displays telling when trains and busses are arriving.

Prioritize these investments to improve capacity of the existing road system rather than adding road miles and lanes.

Provide warning far enough in advance that alternate routes, methods of transportation may be chosen.

Suggest high priority be given to timing traffic signals and pedestrian countdown signs.

This is a bandaid solution. What about restricting store hours, mandating closures during commute hours so that trips can be sorted out? What about staggered office hours?

Added infrastructure needs to not be too technical to end up with it stuck in a dead end or economically unmaintainable.

Clearing crashes more quickly would help congestion.

Congestion Pricing is an incredible tool that should be considered.

Depends upon the technology involved. Each technology solution must be analyzed for cost-effectiveness and usefulness in comparison to other investments.

Give the same weight to pedestrian delay, transit delay, and bike delay as engineers give to motor vehicle delay when considering signal timing. I can drive across downtown on all greens, but I've never been able to walk more than a few blocks before waiting at a light. Pedestrian "left turns" require waiting for two lights while drivers only have to wait for one.

Have low tech backup.
Hiring competent programmers and engineers.

I have noticed positive changes since the signs added to the interstate and highways that note travel times to specific points.

I would disagree with giving transit priority at intersections, they have their own bridge isn't that good enough, all too often I am left sitting at a light trying to figure out why it is not changing and then I see the trolley or light rail go by and I know why.

Include the 'bike trip' sensors too! So that bicyclists are able to activate the cross lights.

Let's be smarter about the resources we already have by using technology to maximize utility of streets.

Making sure that the systems chosen can be integrated and easily updated without shutting down critical functions. Also security--hacking into a traffic system could cause chaos.

Maximize use of bus jump lanes and signal prioritization.

MORE crosswalks, more signaled crosswalks, more raised crosswalks, and police action when cars make walking unsafe as happens here constantly, daily.

More stop lights, flashing beacons, crossings with sound, raised crossings, campaigns to promote the actual law: 'every corner is a crosswalk!' all of which should be able to detect pedestrian activity and should keep a light red for traffic until the elderly, infirm, wheelchair-bound, etc., can actually reach the next sidewalk before cars start harassing and menacing them.

Pedestrian and bicycle traffic, as well as transit should be prioritized over cars where feasible. It is perfectly ok to make it clear that these are preferred transportation options and that those who drive are going to face continued and worsening problems with congestion. No one benefits from having buses and bicycles stuck in traffic.

Pedestrian and bicyclist safety above vehicular convenience.

Pedestrian signals at intersections should not require a button to be pushed to request crossing. Stand-alone pedestrian crossings should use a standard traffic light or HAWK signal instead of the useless and often ignored Rapid Flash Beacon.

People need to get out of their cars and bike and walk. biking and walking will solve all of the above problems in addition to the obvious health care problems... Maybe require people to drive hybrids, or incentivize cycling trips.

Simple solutions are already ready and developed to deploy.

Technology should also help us to tax use more effectively.

This is good, but your bullet points neglect to mention the potential of using technology for enforcement. Speed cameras are a proven safety tool that the metro region and state has long neglected. It's time to join the 21st Century and change outdated speed ticketing laws and install speed cameras to make sure our streets are safe.
This is good. Much more transit priority. Do use with care. In Portland, "smart" programming of traffic signals has often had the impact of incentivizing motor vehicle travel through more signal time at "major" streets at the expense of bike/ped travel which has to press a button or locate itself rather precisely on a sensor in order to even get a traffic phase at all. I see that whole "upgrade" as actually a step backward from simple timed traffic signals because of the negative impact on bike/ped travel.

This seems like it should be top priority, effects nearly all aspects of travel making it more efficient which saves time and resources for all.

This would be useful but depends on how expensive it is. May not be worth a high cost.

Timing traffic signals to maximize efficiency. transit priority.

Using technology is a must, but let us not forget to properly maintain our systems. Recent news about Tri-Mets problems with poor maintenance highlight the need to maintain our systems.

Walking and biking safety.

Would love to see some bike-first signals. Getting rid of right turns on red would be FINE. Also, please make pedestrian countdown signs honest! Some of them lie (about when the light is actually going to turn yellow) and it undermines the credibility of the whole system.

Yes, if there is a substantial benefit/cost ratio that does not require high maintenance, nor is quickly outdated or otherwise vulnerable.

yes, weigh costs to benefits though.

Ability to communicate traffic flow information to general public on a widespread basis.

Again, consider return on investment. In this case, technological improvements that save cost or improve system efficiency should be prioritized (even if it's not necessarily observable to the rider).

Don't just manage for cars - keep pedestrians in mind.

Equity, privacy, transparency.

How to engage users of the system.

I rarely use the street car. The primary reason? I can almost always walk faster than getting to my destination than waiting. If I'm in the heart of downtown near the Central Library and wanted to ride the street car to my condo which is located at NW 9th and NW Northrup, if the streetcar stop says the wait for the street car will be more than 4-5 minutes I can almost always beat it by simply walking. While I know that some people don't want to walk, and if you are going a longer distance it may save some time, but it would be nice to see some sort of traffic signal trigger that allows the signal to change when the streetcar is approaching so that the street car is a bit more rapid.

ITS that improves transit travel times and reliability and improvements that increase safety for bikes and peds should be the highest priorities.

Need to match expense with actual utility.
One annoyance in the city of Portland that needs to be addressed through information is that somehow many pedestrians and bicyclists have come to believe that they always have right of way (i.e. a pedestrian will not be at a cross walk, and unlawfully step out into moving traffic. There needs to be a sting to start giving out significant tickets to these people since they interfere with the normal flow of traffic and un-do the planned flow. An info campaign explaining that cars are only supposed to stop for Pedestrians when they are at a marked cross walk would be another way to help address this issue.

Safety, cost. Slow traffic means more emmissions. This is the cheapest way to improve transit efficiency, for all types of transit. This should not detract from actually providing service. I would rather cleaner, more frequent buses, than timed signals.

Timing traffic signals is a really great one, particularly for pedestrians. Transit priority is great if it can integrate without disrupting traffic flow completely. We need to keep car/bike/pedestrian speed in consideration - cars still have the priority on lights etc. I know moving vehicular traffic needs to be consistent but when it impacts other modes it becomes dangerous.

All sorts of gadgets to ensure cars have sensors. Maybe make drivers start to have to stop get out of the car and push a button to activate a signal to continue

As the population ages, the percent of people who can actually make it across some intersections on foot before a light changes will decrease. And left hand turns allowed while the walk sign is on send a message to me. Survival of only the fittest is the plan.

Being very careful when assessing the value of technology investments with the improvements they bring to the issue they're addressing.

But don't spend to much on it as there are lots of existing apps out there & other cities that have done this so learn from them or use what they are instead of trying to "build our own unique overpriced system."

Honest benefit to cost.

I have noticed the street lights being timed better to move traffic through downtown. This is excellent. More left hand flashing arrows need to be added, too.

Look into other cities that have implemented technology to manage transportation and learn from them.

Making the existing system more efficient should be the highest priority.

More dynamic transit information.

Prioritize safety and active transportation, not vehicle travel times.
Rigorous cost/benefit analysis of various methods.
Safety should be priority.
Smart traffic signals work.
The blue lights indicating that a bike has triggered the loop are a God-send. The coming mix of semi-autonomous vehicles with traditional road users will make this section particularly challenging, but also particularly important. Taking advantage of real-time congestion data should benefit everyone.
These are all relatively inexpensive fixes that can improve traffic flow.
This should be part and parcel of the design. The question is very limited.
Traffic lights on side streets used by drivers to shave a few seconds off their travel time to protect pedestrians.
Transit should have it's own lanes on busy well-traveled transit streets.
Yes, I support but not as much as alternatives to single occupancy vehicle transportation.
"Rest on red" where lights turn red when oncoming traffic is speeding.
Again, I would like to see this as a secondary priority after upgrading alternate commuter routes (safe walking and bicycling).
As long as these bells and whistles don't take away from maintaining what we have.
Be wary of countdown signals and the effect they can have on cars speeding up to get through the changing light.
better timing on lights, increase ODOT response teams.
Buses in particular should get the right-of-way, e.g. being able to change signals to pass through.
Continue to improve access (especially real-time data for apps) to information to improve decision-making about multi-modal options, costs, times, and impacts.
Cool stuff - definitely timing lights to allow easier flow of pedestrian & cycling traffic, as improving safety. The big red flashing “NO RIGHT TURN ON RED” sign on Rosa Parks & I-5 S entrance is a good example.
Cost effective means of improving active transportation should be explored.
Cost vs value. Technology is expensive.
Cover Oregon.
D/k
Durability and environmental sustainability of the implemented technology.
How not to take too much money from the other priorities.
I would still like to know more specifically what this means.
I would support any improvement in this area that contributes to cars being able to freely and efficiently move around the area.
I wouldn't spend a lot of money doing this - it's a lower priority.
If it works of course. I know the timing of traffic signals does.
Keeping traffic at a slow to moderate pace and less standing cars at intersections - otherwise I don't know.
Making data accessible to the public is also important so that people know what's in store for them on their way from one place to another.
Making transit more efficient. Discourage cars.
Not sure, it's all important. Priority to keeping traffic moving smoothly.
Only if it makes traffic move more quickly and efficiently.
Plus there are many technologies that we could use and should invest in creating. We could use a robust bicycle map app (what we have now is not good enough). We should invest in electric assist bicycling technology in order to make this option available for more people.
Priority should be given to alternative means of transportation - public, bikes, walking.
Public transportation and emergency vehicles should have priority getting through traffic signals. No point in taking the bus if it's no faster than driving through stop and go traffic. Traffic signals that sense the presence of a vehicle on infrequently used roads would be helpful --- would only need to change on the main road when a car is actually at the intersection rather than at a regular interval.
Robot cars now! Finally car drivers will maybe have to obey speed and exercise caution if they insurance is tied to how they drive because of technological monitoring. Please institute tolls and congestion charges ASAP!
Still not sure what this means. Does it mean investing venture capital to fund an open parking space app for downtown parking?
The signs on Hwy 26 and I-5 are a good start to indicate travel times - use signs like on I-5 just south of Seattle to change the speed limit according to conditions. More road cams on tripcheck.org would be good.
The transit tracker from TriMet is very useful as are traffic lights with countdowns.
These things should be cheap so shouldn't require a lot of investment.
This is a no brainer in terms on optimizing the existing capacity of our road network.
Time for traffic drones!
To a limited amount. Not a high priority.
Tolling, congestion pricing, reversible lanes, better light timing.
Traffic cameras, signal synchronization, eliminate red light cameras.
Transit should have priority at intersections for sure. Traffic signals should be designed to slow down traffic. Signals should be set at bicycling speeds.
Transit signal priority is an important use of technology.
We need to take care of basics first and then tech a little at a time.
We should be using ITS technologies to prioritize commercial vehicles including freight and public transit.
Where there are those effective blinking lights at pedestrian crosswalks (e.g. NE 33rd and Emerson; NE Killingsworth & 30th) walkers must always press the button. The blinking lights go on quickly and it's a shame that some pedestrians don't bother to press the button before walking into the street. Folks would howl at the suggestion, but maybe it would work to hand out a few tickets to walkers at such crosswalks who do not use the blinking light button.

Who knew i would love the walk sign countdown as much as i do but it's a great asset as a driver, as well as a pedestrian, to be able to time the light. to recognize earlier whether to speed up or slow down... it calms down the entire traffic light experience. some traffic signals are worse than others but the biggest problem is in Gresham where they have the longest lights in the world! painting/striping the crosswalks, speedbumps, bike lanes, etc. needs to be kept up or it doesn't do any good: especially those edges on curbs in center lanes or that bikes will have to bump over, that kind of thing.

Yes, however the big, expensive new signs on the freeways were a big waste of money in my opinion.

A big YES on this one. There are far too many intersections, arterials in this city which do not function well. Let's take Sandy-Burnside feeding into Couch -- what a mess. Thanks Sam Adams. Thanks a lot.

A no brainer. But also consider using social media to assist in these items including free apps for identifying bottlenecks so as to avoid.

Adding left turn signals to certain intersections around town would improve safety and reduce driver frustrations (for example, in my neighborhood at NE 33rd and Fremont).

Analyze traffic data to help prioritize where money would best be spent and for what technology, since we can't probably afford to do the same everywhere.

Anything that convinces drivers that stop signs, speed limits and other rules about what they can and cannot do will be enforced. There is a stop sign on the corner that my house sits on, and I would estimate that only 25% of drivers even slow down when they come to the corner -- most drivers seem to have no intention of stopping unless a big SUV with the right of way will run into them.

Be sure to remember that different people have different accessibility and familiarity with technology. Be sure the technology works well and is easily understood and used.

Bike/pedestrian transit should be given priority at intersections. Not cars.

Blend in the street repairs and modifications at the same time. Don't spread them out so the streets have to be repaired then torn up and repaired for each thing do it once and get all the jobs done.

But more investment here means less elsewhere, not more total dollars.

Coordinated planning. Ensuring pedestrians and bicycles don't wait too long.

Cross walk countdown/safety on 2+ lane roads.
EXCEPT transit priority. What is the rational reason for giving freeloaders on transit (they pay only 30%) of the operating cost and NONE of the construction cost of transit priority over cars which pay over 100% of their actual costs.

Good use of resources and efficiency.

I think it is particularly important to use technology to make our roads safer, mainly be ensuring that driving is done below the speed limits.

If this is cost effective as compared with other options, then do it. If it looks like fancy frills instead of filling potholes, you will need a lot of communication around that. (And that better not be true!)

Improved traffic signal timing; "smart" signals; Max, streetcar and bus priority at signalized intersections; greater pedestrian priority and reduced wait periods at major and difficult pedestrian crossings (e.g., NE Sandy in Hollywood district).

Innovation is great, where it’s reasonable, affordable, and practical. Even better is adopting practices already proven effective elsewhere.

like all of these questions, they are written in a way that makes it hard to say no. the question is what is the cost? In general, using technology to improve safety on our roads and to encourage greater and more safe use of alternatives to automobiles is a good thing.

Please review traffic signal timing to confirm that they meet the needs of road users at all hours of travel. I can think of a few signals in inner northeast that are on a timer that give a green for empty roads and red for morning commuters on the main road.

Prioritize pedestrian, cyclist and auto passenger safety, as well as avoidance of expensive capacity additions. Use express toll lanes to reduce freeway congestion.

Safety.

Safety first.

Safety of bicycles and pedestrians crossing our streets. Giving transit priority.

See above comments!

See answer to question 3.

Seems like a no-brainer.

Technology should be used as a means to monitor and improve the flow of traffic.

Technology use.

The stop light on the east end of the Broadway bridge is the worse in town. Fix it please.

The testing of the blue lights for bicycle routes seems to work well. This is an example of creative thinking and low-cost options that help improve traffic flow and keep tempers cool.

These are relatively inexpensive ways to dramatically improve safety and the overall transit experience.
This investment should be paired with an educational campaign to explain the benefits of making these technological improvements when there still may be a need to fix potholes and add curb cuts to sidewalks.

This makes a lot of sense to me. I like the transit apps too.

This seems like a no-brainer. Don't risk too much in software that might not work, do have a scrappy approach to tech projects.

This should be a priority over street widening. Wide streets with multiple traffic lanes split up communities. Any projects to address congestion should start with management, and save road widening as a last resort.

This shouldn't require huge investment.

Timing traffic signals; pedestrian countdowns.

Traffic flow is most important. Keep it moving, and spend more public money on greener transportation - bikes and sidewalks and Trimet.

Transit and pedestrians need priority; idling reduction is a good idea.

Transit priority at intersections should be a major focus.

Utilize technology to improve traffic flow. Adaptive signals, timing sensors, etc.

We can be using technology to help transit riders and cyclists. Give priority to peds, cyclists, and transit. We can keep autos running smoothly, but they should not be our priority.

We could also work on changing irrational intersection design, etc.

We have a lot of road uses in Portland central and without superior planning and technology, it will just become more congested and dangerous for all concerned.

We should use technology to reduce transportation's impact on climate change.

When lights aren't timed cars are using more fuel and creating more pollution and greenhouse gases.

Yes, if cost efficient in reducing pollution, GHGs.

All the above, plus blinking yellow left turn signals to keep car traffic moving at low volume times. More technology on transit, too - like the rest of the world has had for years - refillable "credit card" type payment method (or by phone payment these days).

Bike/ped: yes Congestion reduction through signals? I'd rather see congestion reduction by fewer car trips, thanks.

Build high level technical security in from the start to avoid future hacking/terrorist vulnerabilities. Use local, experienced and reliable companies vs relying on large, out of state vendors.

By their nature, these should be low cost improvements. It's not necessary to spend a lot of money here.

Careful cost benefit studies: not all areas warrant this.

Cost to Community and Return on investment.
Cost. Such projects usually require outside contractors. Outside contractors are often selected because of political connections. The contracting process and contract terms should be rigorously reviewed to prevent bad agreements and cost overruns.

Does this policy encourage people to drive more, or make driving more convenient? (If so, my opinion is that it is not something to engage in). Does this policy encourage people to use transit more? (If so, my opinion is that the policy is something to engage in).

Encouraging further private investment in the surrounding urban environment.

Focus on pedestrian and air quality.

How to make the most of existing funds (or even less).

Independent lanes for trains in urban centers, traffic signal implementation, tickets for reckless drivers.

Intersection priorities should be those walking, then cycling, then driving.

Keep your eyes on the goal of keeping things moving safely and efficiently, and intelligently factor maintenance costs into the estimates. We can live with potholes, but unmaintained tech quickly becomes an unsupportable burden.

Keeping traffic flowing with less obstructions reduces vehicle emissions. This policy must include removing curb extensions where buses board passengers and block traffic - replacing them with bus turnouts so other vehicle traffic can pass.

Make sure whatever is built to control traffic includes bikes too.

Need much better timing on some signals - especially East Burnside.

Need to find way to pay for this that doesn't hurt poorer families.

Pedestrian countdown signs are (too) widely variable, and some traffic lights have disproportionately long or short yellow lights in combination with the too widely variable countdown timers. If there is a technological way to monitor illegal use of technology (cell phones) while driving or biking that would be great - maybe something like the cameras that take photos and send a ticket to speeders or those who run lights? Also as I mentioned before sending electronic signals/messages to transit stops to warn people waiting if there is an issue that will cause a considerable delay in their expected public mode of transportation.

Prioritize active management over new construction.

Prioritize transit and pedestrian safety.

Signal preemption for transit.

The reliability and safety of the technology (really, not promised). Encourage and use local companies when developing. Don't make Portland dependent of Oracle or some other multinational.

Timing of traffic lights is very important as well as vehicle sensors at cross traffic intervals on main and secondary roadways. Lights on these feeder routes should only change when cross traffic actually exists.
Use the INRIX trafficphone app. to pinpoint choke points. More dedicated bus lines in the suburbs or explore toll roads.

Using signals to keep vehicle speeds low in active transportation corridors.

We should be using every tool available to create safer, more efficient, less polluting transportation systems.

Yes and no. The technology aspect is being overdone. Example; the electronic sign on I-84 westbound near the Lloyd Center is useless most of the time and in many cases just impedes traffic with drivers trying to figure it out. Since drivers pay for the roads, money can be better spent and top priority should be improving the roads and adding motor vehicle capacity where needed to reduce congestion.

Yes! We have the tools available - we should use them!

Yes, but get technology that works.

Yes, but not in the list of most important.

Better technology can make driving, walking and biking more efficient and help to reduce traffic and accidents.

But don't spend on costly equipment unless it is very beneficial. I suggest lowering speed limits and greater enforcement of auto regulations.

But this isn't as important as improving biking, walking and transit.

City center pedestrian safety should be a priority. Traffic signals should give transit --especially the streetcars-- priority.

Concentrate on safety for bike and pedestrians. My neighborhood at Hawthorne Blvd. does not have stop lights for pedestrians at many intersections. - just cross walks that are dangerous and ambiguous. Do not give cars priority at intersections. Lower speed limits to 25 MPH, time traffic lights, more lights for pedestrian crossing at intersections.

Cost benefit analysis - technology is great, but only if there are proven benefits that outweigh the costs.

Find ways to use technology where it can enhance our system at a lower cost and while having a lower impact than other options.

Great consideration should be given to be sure that things like signal timing allow persons with disabilities sufficient time to complete street crossing.

I definitely agree with bike/pedestrian right-of-way in timing lights at intersections.

I love the new countdown walk signs.

I support all the examples given above. I especially promote timing traffic signals such as on SE Broadway. Seems like an easy fix to reduce driver frustration which may cause them to run reds and jump prematurely into intersections.
I'd also like to see traffic signals timed to advanced notice loops in trails so that trail users don't have to stop at every intersection, push a button and wait. Detector loops similar to those for vehicles would be really helpful.

It seems like a lot of this is being done already. Love the countdown signals.

Make data available to the public via Civic Apps.

Make sure it is cost effective and really needed don't spend too much money on these.

More red light cameras will decrease crashes and help pay for those that occur.

No ideas, would love improved signage for pedestrians.

No new taxes or fees for consumers or businesses.

Only Indiana is slower at clearing crashes. Response time and removing vehicles from blocking traffic in Oregon is pathetic.

Oops, see my previous reply. Also, adding more left turn lights on the north/south streets where they intersect Burnside would make that street much safer (such as 28th and 20th).

Pedestrian and bicycle safety first.

Reevaluate the talking busses.

Safety and the encouragement of using transit and walking.

Small investments where it prevents need for more investment in roads.

Speeding cameras should be ubiquitous. Big speeding and running lights and stop signs automatically and consistently resulted in fines, these infractions would stop and our streets would be far, far safer.

Start right away.

Sure, but so what?, Technology is part of the world we live in , if we invest in technology it better work. Walking and bikes are low tech solutions that are almost idiot proof, Hi tech transit that is unreliable will put people in low tech cars.

Sure, but not at the expense of the fundamentals - balancing our system so we invest in walking and biking and transit to balance out our overinvestment in auto travel. If we do that, then auto travel will be easier (b/c people who wish to bike and walk and take transit but can't, will now have an outlet) how cool is that.

Sure. Maybe automated tolls on congested bridges or freeways.

Technology can be another pork industry, so competitive bidding and reasonable background checks/research with close monitoring and business intelligence/project management would be fantatsic. Other than some sort of cattle prod that can shock drivers who are texting while driving, I'm not sure I have an opinion other than whatever *secure* method you have to make your job easier and more efficient only seems reasonable.

The focus should be exclusively on improving trips for non-automotive traffic -- mass transit, bikes, pedestrians.
There are many bicycling routes that would especially benefit from bike specific signals. This is critical for keeping biking safe and transit efficient. This may be the number one thing that Portland can do to improve the horrible, horrible traffic gridlock that has been allowed to develop here. It needs to be implemented immediately. This should be a priority. It is low cost and can make everything run smoother. Do not need to build more roads, just make the ones we have work better for everyone. Make sure bicycle and pedestrian technology is included.

Use of digital signs with current information. Use the technology to also make lights green when there is no cross traffic. Yes, however, priority should be given to public transit and human powered options. What I mean by this, is that we should not invest in timed lights that reduce traffic congestion, but rather other options—public transit, bicycles—to do so.

Absolutely invest in more intelligent transportation systems. It is one way to increase capacity without building more roads. An actual drivers test that actually TESTS peoples skills, similar to the one in Ireland where the first time failure rate is something like 75%. Simply requiring people to have a modest amount of skill at operating a motor vehicle would inevitably lead to a better overall transportation system. Drivers here SUCK!

Better monitoring of traffic and better prediction of traffic forecasting could get people with flexible schedules to plan their trips around traffic. By partnering with companies like google accurate traffic forecasting could be a reality.

Both pedestrians & transit should be given priority at intersections. Don't worry about the transit priority, such a small percent use it, help to cut down waiting times for autos so they don't idle to long and pollute. Embrace new tech that is proven to improve traffic conditions for all modes. I am not supporting tracking people's car's bikes or walking add arrival times to all max stops and all downtown bus stops.

I don't know anything about this, just think everything possible should be done for safety and smooth flow. I exclude from this license plate identification cameras. Implementing technology that allows users to maximize existing infrastructure. Improve and upgrade the systems the city has in place first. We have traffic signals--they just aren't timed right. Does the city really need new traffic signals? The newest signals freeze in the winter now and can't be seen under snow and ice. Is the technology appropriate for this area and region? The technology being implemented right now seems untested.
More apps to support and encourage awareness and additional riders. PDX bus is super helpful! As is mobile ticketing. I'd like to see apps like this to help inform bikers when stretches of bike lanes are scheduled to be closed for construction or maintenance issues.

More red light cameras to target motorist violations and increase compliance makes roads safer for everyone.

No on ped countdowns. They invite crossing on flashing, which is unlawful and a key element of gridlock reduction: this is when you turn right on red. Yes on widespread video surveillance, including red light cameras. I want a clear video of the dude stealing my bike. Why can't I have that? Because of his right to privacy? On a public road? Crap. The signs should celebrate the use of technology: "Say cheese!"

Particularly on the west side, traffic signaling needs to be implemented, especially through areas where there is no feasible way to move that much congestion since there is no highway connectors. East Portland/Mult County has the same issue with a N/S connector across Gresham from 84 to 26. I have relied on the pedestrian countdown signs more times than I can count. It's been one of my favorite improvements using technology.

Pedestrian countdown signs are very helpful.

Please time lights to accommodate the speed of bike commuters.

Technology can also be used to collect data so that decisions are made using relevant facts not subjective opinion.

Technology is crucial. It's available. Let's implement it.

The transportation network should be managed by humans working with reliable technology.

Though valuable, I'm dubious about this as the optimal way to improve transportation. The best solutions are surprisingly low tech. Optimal signalling to improve the movement of rail, cyclists, buses and peds is worthwhile. Doing it to improve motorist movement will almost inevitably come at a cost to the former modes.

Timing traffic signals for bikes is great.

Traffic signal timing could probably do more than anything else to relieve congestion and reduce greenhouse gasses. Also, I think increasing the use and accuracy of GPS navigation systems is important. Think how many fewer miles are driven when folks don't get lost, or take the most efficient route between A and B.

Traffic signal timing is imperative, maintaining sufficient lanes, etc.

Transit priority at intersections makes sense to maximize the throughput of people and not wasting tax-payer dollars on having a TriMet driver sit at a red light. Ultimately - free-flow (congestion) pricing will be the technological innovation that makes traffic flow smoothly. They've done it in Stockholm, London, Singapore. We can do it here on the Willamette River Bridges.
Trimet needs to use IT systems to keep track of buses so that they are on-time and so that multiple buses on a route are not bunched together. If buses are supposed to run every 7 minutes, one should arrive every 7 minutes, not 3 buses at the same time every 21 minutes.

Use only technology with a proven track record. We've had enough debacles with bad software, etc.

Using technology will be key in managing the system.

Value-added, not fun gadgets please. Let someone else vett some of this stuff so we do it less expensively.

Volume and speed on major arterials.

What is the most likely failure mode of any particular technology, and how will we ameliorate any unintended consequences?

Yes, as long as the tools are not used to prioritize motor vehicles over other users. First priority should be for active transportation like pedestrians and bicycles. Second for transit. Last for cars.

Again, need to be smart about it. Areas with few lights for crossing needs more dedicated, safe, pedestrian crossings. Need consequences for drivers who don't stop at crosswalks, bikers who play the system by using street or sidewalk just to get across faster, walkers who don't pay attention and create potential traffic problems.

At present I use the alerts to help plan my routes. I use the screens downtown to see when busses and trains are coming. I also use the PDX mobile app to get info when I am out. I feel this use of technology has made using public transit much easier.

I am not sure how this intersects with the other areas - I assume this overlaps because it would affect road and pedestrian/cyclist safety. I think it would be helpful to see where these areas have additional benefits.

Many intersections are dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists because of inadequate or non-existent signals. OR should also consider making right turn on red illegal. It's a significant hazard for pedestrians and bicyclists and encourages drivers to not obey red lights in other situations.

Poverty areas. Rural roads.

Again, you need a maybe button. Sometimes the reliance on technology seems to happen in exchange for common sense.

Choose technology systems with proven track records, no unpleasant surprises. Staff training most important.

Do not give transit priority - it will only slow things down.

Efficiency is good.

Especially Technology like UBER and Smart Taxi, and Streetcar/Bus Express.
Help consumers get and use apps/websites that enable them to see what traffic congestion is like (and where located) on major routes through the city (and even some side roads). Love the big readerboards on I-84 that say how long a travel will take. More information enables consumers to make choices about their travel. If I know snarls are ahead, I can detour, choose to travel later, etc. Additionally, employers should be encouraged to let their employees time-shift their commutes—let folks start the work day earlier/later as needed to avoid the peak congestion times... Or telecommute on certain days.

How to find the most efficient technology to keep commuters/residents aware of travel time. Trimet seems to do a good job of this.

I cant believe this question is actually on here. of course we should use the smartest technology we can afford to make things run smoother. duuh? no wait i changed my mind, we should go back to having police at every corner directing traffic. it would probably go smoother actually, or we can redesign intersections so that they naturally run smoother.

I have already mentioned in a previous comment the need for timing lights realistically for pedestrians as well as other vehicles. Also, I very much applaud the move to put in bike-specific signals at especially dangerous intersections. This makes it much easier to share the road safely! More of these, please.

I suggest countdown blinders so that cars / drivers do not use them to anticipate light changes. Perhaps adopting an international style Red+Yellow indicator to signal "ready" to drivers.

I'd look at implementing these in the highest use areas first.

Include Vehicle Miles/Ton Traveled and congestion pricing.

Just make sure the technology HELPS the movement of vehicles and not hinder.

Light timing on major arterials should be mandatory. At times outside of rush-hour, the flashing yellow and flashing red should be used so one need not ever have to stop on a major arterial to let a cross street through.

Look at how to avoid idling vehicles.

Make pedestrian counts the default. We shouldn't need to hit a button.

More data is always better, but the viewpoint is more important. Please think outside the windshield as many of us conduct our lives completely without a car.

Not only transit priority, but actually set up a good system - especially in places like downtown Portland - similar to Copenhagen where there are dedicated signals for bikes.

Please take into consideration the timing of the lights. this can make for horrible traffic problems. Time them appropriately.

Practicality and 'best (most efficient) bang for the buck'.

Public transportation and human powered transportation needs to take a clear priority over cars. Bike and crossing signals should stop cars instantly instead of waiting.
Remember cars are the main mode of transportation in the metro area and keeping streets and freeways moving is the most important.

Synchronize traffic lights and educate drivers to drive the set speed to make all the lights. San Francisco had and used this technology at least 50 years ago!

The simplest things are most important---- make sure that machines for ticketing work at all sites.

The technology should help manage the transportation system but it should not require active users who should be focusing solely on their task at hand, i.e. driving or riding!

There has to be a way to make traffic signalling more efficient for all road users like more bike activated signals and prioritize pedestrian signals, it’s ridiculous how long it takes at some intersections to wait for a light to cross. This is one reason people jaywalk.

This also should be a priority if the technology can assist the traffic flow to keep traffic moving. Also the residential streets need more traffic lights that change according to the weight sensors and not the timing of red to green especially after rush hour traffic.

This is not a high priority in my opinion, compared to our other needs.

This is one thing that might actually be a good idea. Right now the light are timed so that you have to waste gas by idling for long periods of time. This must change unless we are only interested in theoretical green things.

Timing traffic lights, synching railroad and light rail signals.

Using technology to favor non-motorized traffic and transit is a fine goal.

Wifi on public transit! Using analysis! Citizen reporting of frustrating transportation areas.

Be careful about the use of more technology just because it exists. Unless it serves an important, greenhouse-gas reducing function, it may be better to spend that money on a better transit system or more sidewalks.

High traffic time commuter lanes, better traffic flow via signals and ped. walkways, fixing the constant max delays and interruptions.

If not more frequent rides causing rates to go up, then bring Uber or Lyft to Portland!

It would be good for drivers to have electronic warnings of traffic clogs along their routes.

Technology can be a good thing but only if it speeds up the system. I have to wonder if transit should have priority. I sometimes see one or two passengers holding up a road full of cars. No economy there.

This seems to be a no brainer. Keep traffic flowing.

Yes, but traffic MITIGATION and low-tech solutions shouldn't be overlooked in favor of gadgetry. We should first REDUCE traffic (again: vibrant community cores, disbursed employment & recreation, and income-balanced neighborhoods). Then low-tech engineering like 1-way streets, traffic-routing, roundabouts, underpasses/overpasses, tolls on I-5/205, enticing people to live closer to work, free parking for motorcycles and tiny-cars, etc.
"Smart" traffic signals, rather than the existing 1950s technology, would do much to improve traffic flow.

Absolutely support especially technology and policies to prioritize transit such as ITS.

Again, reducing air toxics from mobile sources should be the driving factor, while optimizing the flow of traffic.

All of the above would together ensure that all forms of transportation are improved.

An app that merges bike routes and bus routes to help plan multi-transport modes of travel. It would be great if it could approximate travel times as well.

Anything that makes it safer.

As long as it doesn't include reader boards, I'm all for this. Reader boards are a complete waste of taxpayer money! Handheld technology and on board automobile technology will render the reader boards extinct. We need a longer term vision to ensure money is better spend. Did I mention that the city/state's spending money on reader boards absolutely drive me crazy!

As long as the technological fixes are truly cost effective, not just the latest "shiny" thing. Those signs about how long it's going to take to get to 217, etc. mean nothing to me - "so what? Now I know how long I'm stuck." The air pollution reduction is important. Maybe the London model.

Be careful. Some of these technological fixes may seem cool, but don't have a payoff that justifies the expense. My favorite example is the new electronic signs telling me how long it takes to get to someplace. Interesting, I suppose, but not useful.

Begin with routes that have high numbers of commuters (Salem, OHSU, VA, Nike, Intel). Look at ways to make shuttles to let more people access these.

Better traffic signal timing is definitely necessary in some high volume areas. Dedicated turn signals would help clear some high volume intersections as well.

Better traffic timing and sensors would help.

Bring this technology to the suburbs that do not use it.

Carefully study the specifics of how these improvements in the signal timing will affect the actual traffic flow. Traffic engineers do not always come up with the best approaches - talk to the communities for input.

Cost.

Cost. For example, the new signs on I-5 seem silly to me i.e. what good does it do to know that it will take X minutes to get to 217? Seems like those funds could have been better used. So also flexibility with the way funds are used.

Density.

Effectiveness/need.
First, read: Reinventing the Automobile: Personal Urban Mobility for the 21st Century by William J. Mitchell (Author), Chris E Borroni-Bird (Author), Lawrence D Burns (Author)  

Require rigorous testing and continuing education for the right to obtain a drivers license. Use technology (gps speed controls, red light cameras etc) to ensure compliance with existing laws until driverless technologies are implemented. Put teeth into sanctions for scofflaws. Remove unsafe drivers from the roads.

For some reason, the timing of the lights downtown seems to be the worst offender in my mind. Ha, this one kills me. Portland claims to be so "innovative" about transportation, when all this time, they haven't even discussed the one thing that could easily solve most traffic jams and at the same time, lessen our carbon footprint (no, it isn't bicycles): timing traffic signals. This one is a no-brainer. I can't recall a city layout that forces cars to be as fuel-inefficient as Portland's. Go 1/4 mile, stop at red light. Go another 1/4 mile, stop at red light. WOW. We are so behind other cities on this one tactic, that would speed up traffic, boost productivity, lessen air pollution and make for a happier populace. Get with it PDX.

If you want alternative auto routes make sure that you actually make those real. Currently alternatives are not sufficient.

It makes sense to use technology to optimize traffic. Cars are not going away, and we don't want drivers to waste time or gas. These improvements would be the least expensive of the options to improve car traffic while NOT widening roads, for example. Also technology could help with bike crossings and safety.

It will take collective thinking which includes not only technology but what is happening on the ground (the public) to arrive at best solutions for real problems. Case in point, the Tigard interchange, from 5 to 217 ramp joist that is lifting. Everyone is blaming someone else, no resolution that I'm aware of.

Keep bike lanes clear of vegetation and debris at same level streets are cleaned.

Laying lines when the road is already torn up. WiFi for the WHOLE city/METRO area. Earthquake prep to be planned in.

Look at creating incentives for stop-engine-at-idle equipped vehicles and require such engines by a date certain.

Lower priority than Bike / Walk paths.

Maybe. I think the pedestrian countdown is very dangerous. sometimes it is meaningful other times not. slowing down to not run a yellow light based on the countdown then when it doesn't change makes me risk getting rear ended.

More emphasis should be placed on analyzing and strategizing improvements, numerically by civil/industrial engineers. Then determine the most appropriate technologies to implement these changes. Change for the sake of change, without a plan, can lead to a waste of resources. The plan should be created from detailed analysis. That may mean early expenditure on analysis equipment.

Most drivers want to be "first" and are not generous or caring.
Safety of pedestrians and cyclists. More enforcement needed to get compliance.

Signal timing is important to keep traffic flowing. The use of cameras to monitor and adjust traffic flow is a good way to go.

Support for traffic advisory mobile apps.

Technology is fine, but it has to be backed up (manually) in the event of severe weather, earthquake, and power outages.

The fact that most people have smart phones and don't need traffic info. Keep it on the operational side.

The new electronic signage on some of the major roads giving information to drivers are very helpful.

This area is less of a priority than the transit system and walking/biking trails. Timing traffic signals during rush hours would go a long way in cutting down on gas use.

This is an exciting and important area for research and investment.

This is useful but not as relevant as other options mentioned previously. Drivers need to be educated not to idle cars.

This just makes a lot of sense to help keep people safe.

Thought this was already being done. Why not? Timing traffic signals and clearing crashes quickly appears to be more an issue of manpower rather than technology and should be a lower cost priority.

Timing signals should be a priority.

Timing!! This seems to cause lots of traffic in areas that I drive. Also, creating better merges; right now this is what causes most traffic back ups around town.

UBER.

Unsure.

Use this technology widely and effectively.

Where investments would benefit the most alternative-transit users, where they might convert the most from SOV to alternatives.

Where it supports better mass transit, cycling, and pedestrian travel, I support more investment in technology. Funds spent to keep cars moving does not seem like a good investment at this point.

Yes! The technologies listed above can make an enormous difference in reducing travel times and emissions. However they are also invisible to the public. This area is a great opportunity to make the public aware of the potential improvements and that many are cost effective.

Yes, please. Traffic has been worse and worse in the Portland Metro area. Also, some lights seem to need to calibrated for better flow.

Yes, this has proven to be a cost effective way of spending investment dollars throughout the regional transportation system resulting in positive and efficient improvements to moving vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists.
A woman died in 2013 while walking her dog in a crosswalk on NE Glisan & NE 117th Avenue. I live on NE 117th Avenue and have never used that crosswalk in 13 years. There are bus stops on both sides of NE Glisan and it’s very difficult to see people in the crosswalk. If the crosswalk had flashing lights, that woman’s death may have been prevented.

Again, issues are personal cost and taxation. I do love the idea of timing traffic signals better, though, but I have already noted great improvement in pedestrian countdown signs and don’t think we need much more investment in this area. As far as giving transit priority at intersections, I think our current bus and MAX traffic laws are fine as they are.

All of the above should be worked on.

All of the stop lights in Portland could use an update on getting traffic moving. We’re often forced to sit at a red light when no other cars are in sight.

Anything to improve traffic flow on highways and main throughways.

Better access to crosswalks with signals that alert drivers to pedestrians as well as better lighting at night at crosswalks.

Consider the demographics - prioritize - get community feedback.

Eliminating the signal lights at freeway on ramps would greatly decrease idleing.

Given evidence-based integration of such dynamic tools toward efficiency, this is the means by which to manage and monitor efforts to improve transportation.

I support some of these measures, but too much flashing, timing and signs can be distracting. We love COMET.

Let’s time the lights so they are more efficient. Also try to get the max to not stop so much traffic on 122nd. It gets backed up pretty fast when the max comes one right after the other.

More informational signs directing people away from heavy traffic.

Portland has a growing traffic problem. Without investment in this area we will see this increase as a problem. Technology, timing of traffic lights in particular, can help with this.

Traffic patterns. I live on the east side and am constantly being delayed by the max as one will come and the main cross streets aren’t cleared before the next one comes. It backs up traffic considerably on the streets. Also synching the lights is better on the environment as traffic idles less.

Again, keeping cars moving reduces emissions.

Being realistic - and getting competitive quotes. The city consistently overpays, and gets substandard products. Like the disappearing ink (paint) that Sam Adams painted the stupid bike boxes with.

Congestion pricing and more express bus routes.

Cost.

Good investments.
How to implement it quickly and efficiently as possible. Keep it cost effective - no unnecessary frills. Prioritize ped/bike convenience and safety. Technological solutions can be expensive. Monitor cost-effectiveness within the larger context of improvements.

The overhead signs (federal government?) on freeways predicting driving time, road conditions and accidents are extremely helpful. The cross walks lights on "major" roads are helpful to pedestrians but as long as they don't get overdone too.

These are all great tools to wring the maximum amount of mobility out of current infrastructure. Great uses of money.

This is a stupid question. Why do we even have lights that aren't "timed"? You've had the capability for a long time, but have failed to use it. I've always assumed that you time the lights for maximum traffic stoppage - because that's what you've achieved. Your engineers have not shown any ability to produce or even maintain traffic flow. Case 1: SW Broadway south past PSU was once timed for 12 mph traffic until the PSU blocks, then 14mph got you out of downtown. Now it's fubar'd. Case 2: West Burnside inbound AM commute with timed countdown walk lights allows drivers to proceed or slow for lights (despite the rhetoric of some city engineers, the drivers I see do NOT 'push it' to make the next light, they slow when it's obvious they won't make it) It works - until the 5 way at SW Alder, where suddenly, we have an out of sequence light, a traffic camera to assign tickets BUT NO COUNT DOWN CROSSWALK LIGHT VISIBLE TO EAST BOUND DRIVERS THAT APPROACH FROM THE WEST. Of course you get to send out tickets, obviously you've set up the drivers to get caught and ticketed, and your disclaimer that "it only pays for the cost of the camera" is patently BS. If you wanted a safe intersection, you'd put in a count-down crosswalk light that drivers could see as they approach, before the blinding morning sunlight rendered traffic.

Cost of the technology and obsolescence.

Depends entirely on what kind of technology is contemplated and what it's like cost-effectiveness might be. What do you have in mind?

Invest our money on economically sustainable projects.

keep cars moving to reduce pollution, but make driving less convenient than other forms of transit. maintain bike and ped safety first.

Leverage the cell-based locators everyone has.

Make walking, biking, and taking transit more convenient than driving a car, including signal priority and timing which favors non - car transportation choices.

Man, some of the light times are SO ridiculous. And the back-up from 26 to 405/26 is just too much.

Not sure.

Prioritize pedestrian safety.

Really great bang for the buck, this should be fully funded and made a priority.
Seems to me this is a given. It has to happen.

Smoother traffic flow.

The signs giving time to a certain area are very helpful. More of this type of technology would be helpful as our freeways especially are getting more crowded.

Traffic timing now is horrible, especially for bicycles. West end of the Sellwood Bridge is a traffic engineering disaster. Why do bicycles have to wait an extraordinary long time not just once but twice, and with no space to safely wait? Why not just go straight across from the sidewalk to the cemetery in one stop? Just plain stupid.

Bicycle lanes need more frequent cleaning during the fall season, wet leaves and tree branches are hazards. Cleanup after accidents needs to be the entire crash site. Too many times I’ve come home with auto glass in the soles of my shoes or tires due to lack of cleanup. The lights on Scholls Ferry Road need to be timed better. They need to be synchronized, especially during rush hours, it gets absolutely ridiculously backed up because the lights are not synchronized. Please see downtown Hillsboro and downtown Portland for good examples of timing. There needs to be more bus turnout lanes, especially on high traffic roads so riders, pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers can be safer.

Cost vs. effectiveness of technology, impact on traffic flow.

Especially more work on the timing between yellow, red, and green on the traffic signals.

Giving transit priority at intersections must includes bike lanes.

I do support this somewhat.

I especially like pedestrian countdown signs as they let you know the time left to cross an intersection.

Instead of using timed signals, use sensors, so that people don’t wait forever for a light to change when no one is there.

Love, love, love the flashing yellow left-hand turn lights. This is SO efficient as its often safe to turn left and you don’t need to stop the oncoming cars. More changes like this please! Love lights with sensors!

Make sure changes to main flow don’t overly adversely impact other traffic. Saving a few seconds on the main flow shouldn’t translates to tens of seconds or minutes to the other users. Currently that is what happens so often and other traffic suffers through long waits or delays.

Making sure collision debris is adequately picked up instead of left in the bike lanes or on the shoulders.

Manage the car system by making it harder to drive and easier to use active transportation.

Ongoing study of traffic signal timing. This seems to be rather opaque at many large intersections. Great idea to give public transportation priority at intersections.

Safety and traffic flow, crash statistics and fatalities should be of primary importance. Intersection cameras on major roads slow people down and help control traffic. Timing the light systems to work in synchronization really helps the traffic flow well.
The pedestrian countdown crosswalks are useful because they give a better idea of how long a person has left to cross legally.

The Portland area has a history of messing up technology implementation. Whatever you do, do it COMPETENTLY.

This should be lower priority than some others, but still worth working on.

What would be economically practical while promoting optimum service?

While it is wise to invest in transportation management technology, it can't be relied upon completely. It's a great tool, but should not be the focus of investments.

Yes, please work on synchronizing signals on arterials. Driving from one yellow light to the next wastes time and fuel.

Concentrate on developing a system that prioritizes rapid transit movement.

I agree with everything except giving transit priority at intersections. I don't care for metro's focus of trying to shoehorn us into transit. Most of us like to keep our individuality. Life is too short to be pressed into the mass transit mold.

I support any plan that uses smart thinking to solve problems at a lower cost.

Keep traffic moving quickly.

Limit UGB expansion where transportation infrastructure is inadequate.

Reducing traffic and decreasing vehicle idling time.

Synchronize signals. But those new stupid travel time signs are a complete waste and boondoggle...our smart phones, etc provide better info and it isn't always wrong like the signs.

The additional investment can be done by the private sector. Smartphone apps and congestion pricing can be done with little or no additional tax money.

The difference any technology will make should be measured in user minutes per mile saved. If it cannot be measured, then it is not worthwhile. The cost of the infrastructure and its support should be weighed against the user minutes per mile saved.

This should be a top priority.

Transit should not get priority at signals. Put the bus stops AFTER the signals, with pull outs so they are not blocking traffic that is moving. Washington County's blinking left turn yellow lights are an example of the best improvement I have seen since right turn on red was passed. Lights should be timed for the smooth flow of traffic.

Although I hope its better that what Beaverton has done for the last forty years. I can be driving done a main road and hit every light that is on a side street. Main roads should be able to at least be timed to go through at least one light after being stopped.
Being one who does not drive and walk a lot, the one thing that really burns me up is that I come to a cross walk and hit the button, but the light will stay green even when there are no cars coming and the walk sign with the flow of traffic flow turn white again - this happens when a Max train is coming, but they sometimes sit at the Convention center and Lloyd Center.

Being stuck in traffic adds to air pollution and driver frustration, so having more ways to keep traffic moving is very important.

Cost and effectiveness; safety if it's cost effective. We sometimes overspend for little return for safety. Also better strategies for clearing crashes. We must be the slowest place on the planet for getting traffic moving again.

Efficiency.

Everyone has a phone now. Tap that resource.

Except giving transit a priority status. I'm stuck behind too many empty buses as it is.

Explain this and tax us. Better yet, find a way to tax those of us who use the road and not those who do not. What a great innovation that would be! You could change folks patterns that way.

I like the new informational signs on the freeways and the flexible speed signs. I like the timed lights downtown -- i believe they relieve congestion and pollution -- and frustration -- a LOT.

I love the new advisory speed signs!

I think good use of technology would be great in improving the transportation system. However, the new electronic reader boards are mostly a joke. Especially, on Hwy 26 west bound near Sylvan. The traffic jam caused by this reader board DAILY is ridiculous and will be the cause of many accidents. Just the opposite of the plan.

Let people know how much faster the commutes have become.

Make pedestrian countdown signs voice so that visually impaired and blind people can be safe.

Manage these in a way that makes sense for safety.

Mass transit, peds and bike travel prioritized.

No point in not using it, even if it costs. I also have no problem with the speed cameras in Beaverton. People should just stop speeding. If we don’t have enough police enforcement of traffic laws, then use technology for enforcement or to create efficiency in the overall so enforcement is not as big a problem.

Reducing problems for pedestrians & bicyclists and public transit should be given first priority.

Since 90% of Portland area residents use cars every day to drive to work, recreate, and shop it makes the most sense to invest in the infrastructure that needs the most attention. Portland is already famous for mass transit and biking. Why not make it a more well rounded City and expand the vehicular system as well?

Smart sensors for signal lights so that lights change commensurate with traffic and time of day.
Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits - Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles - Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit - Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life - Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals - Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency.

Speeding commute times.

Studies show that pedestrian count-down signals encourage drivers to speed up through an intersection to "beat the light". Try to make the count-down not visible to autos.

The flashing yellow lights are a perfect example. I would like to encourage more folks to live closer to where they work. The signs on 26 and 217 are a step in the right direction. A way to tell who is driving when and where and taxing them more would be nice. If you use it you should pay for it.

The items above are all good.

The new signs that indicate the time it will take to get to major points are an excellent tool for calming drivers and reducing crazy passing and lane changing. Timing the signals is also excellent. I love that I can (usually) drive through downtown without stopping so long as I go the right speed. Variable speed limits are useful, too.

The traffic delay/travel time signs along I5 and Hwy 26 seem to have really cut down on frenetic passing. Using better technology to 'time' signals would encourage the speed limit, and improve fuel efficiency.

This is a low-hanging fruit and should be first priority.

This point sounds good, but I'm not sure what it actually entails.

Use technology to slow traffic and provide pedestrian safety.

Yes please!! Traffic is predictable month to month and in certain weather conditions. Use technology to keep the signals moving more efficiently.

Yes, but...those new signs on Hwy 217 and Sunset Hwy are kinda dumb. Also, why is there a weird pattern southbound on 217 just before Allan Blvd? Traffic is so slow - always - but there's never anything there, and then it opens up, even though there isn't another lane.

Get rid of "beg buttons"- ped activated signals- and encourage people to cross the street at every signal change. Work to change legislation to allow speed and red light cameras and install them EVERYWHERE! To be fair, add signs well in advance to warn people that speed and redlight compliance is being monitored, and violators will be fined.

Improved signal timing, limit vehicle size for city streets, limit large-vehicle operation times within city limits.

Support local companies.
This should be done all over the city, prioritizing communities with little or no (or ancient) infrastructure.

Where technology can be used to improve transit, that is important particularly giving transit priority at intersections.

Accommodate pedestrian movements while giving transit priority - downtown transit mall does not signal parallel pedestrian crossing when train captures traffic signal.

Again, use the money we have wisely before getting carried away with projects that benefit only a few (if any).

Balancing all users needs.

Basic maintenance and reliability is more important than technology. Technology when used needs to have proven reliability. It also needs to be cost effective. Are the benefits worth the money?

But this will only go so far.

Come on, this is easy.

Communicate clearly the benefits showing how the investment is worth it.

Get rid of the countdown signs. They encourage people to cross against the wait sign and prevent vehicles from turning. especially irksome when a lane was stolen to accommodate bikes. Transit priority is counter to timing traffic signals. look at the congestion the light rail causes by overriding the timing system.

Ideally a system should be less distracting than the new one recently implemented on our highways...great concept, but not easy to use safely.

Increasing safety for walkers, bikers, transit, and other vehicular traffic. Reducing gridlock and its associated energy, economic costs, encouraging non-single occupancy vehicles by favoring other transit methods.

Intelligent & connected traffic signals.

Invest in new systems to inform drivers of bad and light traffic corridors. Use new systems to better manage traffic lights.

It is a mess now.

Keep it cost effective and use for only critical areas.

Keep spending in check.

Let's work on some kind of "automated" spacing system for cars on freeways and main roads -- that will even reduce or eliminate the need for bigger roadways if we can get it to work well.

Look at how Paris' trains are all automated.

Make main streets and commuter traffic the priority.

Mileage taxes.
Of course! Use all the technology available to increase speeds. The faster each vehicle can travel, the more vehicles can use the same space thereby reducing congestion. Remove unnecessary signs like the new travel time signs. What are these for anyway? It seems like you want drivers to use surface streets instead of freeways. Really? Why don’t you ask the neighborhoods about that idea?

Pedestrian safety needs to be a priority.

Private vehicle movement is the priority along with pedestrians.

recognize that, at least for the mid-term, personal auto transportation will be a majority of the mix and provide incentives to move these participants into the public transition mix (higher usage fees, free and adequate parking spaces at transit hubs, etc).

ROUNDABOUTS work really, really well in other countries so we need more and more of them in Portland which would increase the efficiency of moving traffic far more than traffic lights. IF, and only if cameras and computers can make traffic signals more efficient I’d consider that as well.

should be a top priority. Use Blue tooth, cell phones etc. to track usage and time lights. Use signals from police, fire, EMS vehicles to change lights to ensure ease of passage of emergency vehicles.

stupid ODOT signs do NOTHING. Huge waste of money. Coordinated signals, load-sensitive signals.

Support developing as much of the technology locally or regionally as possible. Funding must not be regressive.

The auto isn’t going away and today’s roads are inadequate for commuting and most other purposes.

The state kicker checks should not be returned but invested in transportation and education.

This is a great way to leverage investment. The MAX smart-phone apps that allow buying tickets, or mapping buses/trains in real-time, are great. But how Metro expect to get ticket proceeds from MAX users when we can buy our tickets from an App, and not actually use the ticket unless we see a ticket-taker on the train? Who would bother to buy a ticket in that case? This needs to be re-thought.

This makes good sense.

This seems like an obvious solution. Why even ask the question?

Transit should be under ground. Huge investment but I think it would be worth it. All the good systems have this.

Use of technology to monitor compliance to traffic laws and to cite violaters.

Use technology to help commuters, not as an enforcement mechanism. This is not to argue for speeding, running lights, or any other unsafe practice. I just think that sometimes money is spent unwisely to try to raise revenues.

Would love to know how the stated stats are determined and measured. Too often, the interest is in tech for tech's sake and the benefits are assumed rather than actually proven.

YES YES YES YES YES.
Yes, but make sure it has practical applicability, not just the appearance of a great new gadget. Make sure it actually serves the public and improves transportation.

Yes, integral to road improvements. Do things that help traffic flow. Lay off the speed traps and let traffic move!!!

An assessment by a professional of traffic patterns.

Don't understand new freeway digital boards telling me how long until next freeway--as if I have another choice on which freeway to take to get there. Waste of money.

Integrate to make the system controls smarter to enhance traffic flow during the various volume flows during the day.

More of the flashing yellow arrow left turn signals should be installed throughout the city - there are several intersections where this would be safe and would reduce idling and congestion.

Needs to actively provide the benefit, not just potentially. Potentially, the moon could crash into the Earth, but it doesn't do that.

On-the-spot technology could be very helpful in keeping traffic moving - changing light timing during rush hour, for eg.; I like the pedestrian countdown signs

Pedestrian count down signs are very helpful. I don't understand what the last item in the description means.

Pollution, efficiency, safety and cost.

The fact that we do not do this already speaks volumes about the ineffectiveness of our government and all levels. Government is spending more now in 2014 than at nearly any time in history and it fails again and again. And the recurring message is there is not enough money for schools, for roads, for job creation.

The region is doing all of this now. So what is new and improved?

This should be in the works already.

Time the traffic lights to achieve a better and more efficient traffic flow.

Timing traffic signals are crucial to implementing this policy.

Focus first on the known choke points. And some of the timed signal sequences are set for the speeds that could be maintained 30 years ago; with more congestion now, the lights often "outrun" the traffic, making the roadway act like an untimed road.

I am in favor of timing traffic lights to help alleviate congestion. I am even more in favor of a light system that would give the preferred right of way to public transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. Public buses should not be stuck in the traffic of personal cars. This does not encourage ridership.

Transit needs priority over any other mode of travel.
Absolutely. Period. We can have smaller electric personal vehicles, faster ingress & egress from the city, fewer accidents-
vehicle with biker/pedestrian & vehicle with vehicle, & finally, increase parking including "location notices" directing the car
to the parking spot nearest the passengers destination.

Aren't you doing that now? Of course, you have to keep updating the technology.

As stated above, timing traffic signals, pedestrian countdowns, etc.

If the city or county is required to purchase some system or software or other big technology package, make sure it is spec'd
appropriately in advance, so that we don't have another Health Exchange disaster on our hands.

Look at existing tech solutions and not designing a new tech program from start that often costs considerable more and often
has big bugs in them, costing more $$$.

Cover Oregon a prime example. Don't always have to re-invent the wheel.

Manual Transmission users!

Pedestrians signals need to get smarter. I resent being a step or two away from a ped signal activation button when the
vehicle signal turns green (at those signals that require a ped activation). I also resent going out of direction by a dozen steps
to get to the ped signal activation button.

Start with projects that save on fuel -- like timing traffic signals.

The cost of these technologies should be weighed against the benefit.

Time traffic signals in a way that doesn't allow cars to gather too much speed between intersections.

Timing stoplights to assist in traffic flow.

Titanium Dioxide should coat all sound walls and lane dividers to help with air pollution.

Traffic signal timing is obvious. We need more of it. We also need more automated traffic cameras. Slow people down,
catch speeders and red light runners. That alone could pay for road repair.

Using more sensors to help manage traffic flow and less on a pre written program.

YES YES YES!!! WADOT has been doing an amazing job with this for years. The new speeds signs are a little bit but not all that
helpful. I want more info about which way would be quicker - 405n or 405s?, etc. Smart signals that can tell if cars are
coming and not just timed or tripped when a a car arrives.

Yes, but if there is a low tech solution that works just fine, use it!

Clearing crashes quickly from the MAX tracks, especially.
I like some of the technology that I have seen that improves the flow of traffic. I definitely think that pedestrian countdown signs should have an audible component to help disabled pedestrians get around. I have seen the large highway signs that predict how many minutes it takes to reach I-5 and that seems like a waste unless they are completely solar powered. I like when a sign warns me of a crash up ahead but knowing how long my trip is going to take doesn't impress me very much. I can see how the traffic is moving or not and can use my brain to determine how long I'll be stuck in it. I don't really know about giving buses priority at intersections. Not sure how that would work. I wish there had been a "Sometimes" option on this survey.

Pull transit stops off the road, so busses can be out of traffic while loading and unloading. Time pedestrian crossing signals that turn red not at signalled intersections to not switch so frequently that traffic gets bogged down, by stopping at crosswalks and then a block later stopping at an intersection. I.e. Se 106th and 107th and SE Stark.

Safety, energy efficiency, smooth traffic flow, preparation for automated vehicles.

Yes transit priority needs to be enforced. We constantly see people flying by the bus as it has its blinker on trying to enter the lane again. We have soooo many laws that are seldom enforced.

A better way to make people aware of the technology and have a way for people to access data on their phone and get alerts for their desired route.

As long as the priority is on motor vehicle traffic movement and not mass transit.

Flow of traffic at various times of the day.

Traffic lanes and signal timing, again combining transit priority causes less real opinions from this survey.

Your creating congestion and unsafe conditions by giving transit a priority at intersections. It creates a backlog on each signal then becomes a domino effect.

Again, this works if part of a transportation plan. Show us the plan.

Also include affordable and effective technologies for pedestrians, including way-finding for people with disabilities.

Anything that increases safety for all and convenience for transit riders and walkers is important. Pedestrian countdown signs are great and transit priority at intersections is critical to maintain schedules.

But mostly to give transit, pedestrians, and bike riders higher priority than automobiles.

Concentrate on safety and reducing pollution.

Educate public - especially pedestrians - what a pedestrian countdown sign really means.

I think this time signs on the major highways are ridiculous. They work for Seattle because there really are alternatives. But for Portland what a waste of money!

If we are going to continue to support commuting/travelling by car, we should take advantage of technologies that a) reduce starts/stops (saving fuel/wear and tear) and b) suggest best routes to avoid congestion/accidents.
Let's not turn this into a profit opportunity for anyone. Not only is technology effective for traffic safety and movement, but it should also be applied to limit resource use for road surfaces and energy for lighting, etc., eliminate Stormwater runoff pollution, prevent animal strikes, etc.

One place that needs improvement is the big intersection where future light rail, rail and car traffic all converge in SE just north of Powell Blvd. The intersection at SE 11 & 12 is a mess and light rail hasn’t even started moving through yet. The signals aren't coordinated and wait times are very long.

Please get rid of beg buttons at crosswalks. This is frustrating, inconvenient, and discouraging to people on foot. If active transportation is really a priority, then we should be encouraging people to walk and giving them equal, if not better, treatment at traffic intersections than people driving automobiles.

Simply give transit (MAX, Streetcar, buses) their own lanes! This would increase frequency (which would entice more riders), but also make transit a no-brainer when it comes to sitting in a car in traffic, or taking transit that has it's own lane and get you there in half the time!

Sorry, but my experience is that pedestrian countdown signals encourage pedestrians to leave the curb until the signal says "0", impeding turning movements by vehicular traffic and not improving pedestrian safety.

This is a no-brainer--good luck with Tri-Met, however!

Timing traffic signals essential train volunteers to direct traffic in power outages.

We should also use technology for variable pricing of roadways and tolling bridges to Washington.

All of this is brilliant -- see the timing of lights through downtown that facilitates bike movement; the quick response to pedestrian input at 87th/foster crossing (and 81st/foster). Transit priority at intersections = more reliable transit timing = people more likely to take buses = we all win.

Along the same lines, I would also like to see campaigns directed towards businesses to implement staggered start and end times for their employees, when reasonable, in an effort to reduce rush hour congestion and shorten commute times. Most offices do not need all of their employees at 8am and could shift some to earlier or later starts.

At bike & pedestrian path crossing, offer a signalized crossing which will STOP the right turn on red. This is especially needed along the I-205 bike path. Drivers are looking left as they turn right, and the signals are timed so that they get a green as the bike path gets the "walk" sign.

Funding and citizen priority.
Pedestrian controls only make intersections safer when they're working properly. We need a better way to keep track of ones that have broken. I've seen one that never changes to a walk signal (W side of SE 112th & SE Division St. moving S), causing pedestrians to cross against the control, and worse one that gave an audible walk signal before the light had stopped traffic (E side of 82nd & Sandy moving S). Hopefully both of these have since been fixed. Coordinating walk signals with MAX preferential treatment improves safety (and has been more evident recently).

The problem seems to be gov. buys the most expensive systems, that on that overall under perform or just do not work, thus waste money with little consequence. Then complain there is not enough money to do what needs to be done!

82nd Avenue.
Better control of traffic flow and growth oriented projects.
Focus improvements where transit is in use. Be creative without reinventing proven technologies.
Go beyond just timing signals but actively monitoring and adjusting timing to balance system on the fly. Providing data to navigation systems and smart phones to shift traffic patterns to balance system.
I support transit priority at intersections. In this category we should NOT prioritize single-occupancy vehicle speed.

Look for areas with the greatest potential for immediate improvement.
Making the system safer will improve the efficiency.
Of course- who says no to safety. The problem comes in to play when government "plays" the system.. by messing with stop signals in an effort to raise money.. that's just one example of government's ongoing effort to find ways to assess average citizens using schemes that are simply a by product of a government class that feels it is entitled to feast on taxpayers at will.

On-ramp traffic lights and freeway signs with time to popular destination do a lot to improve safety, help people avoid traffic tie-ups, and smooth the flow of traffic in metropolitan Portland.
Please put pedestrian countdown signs EVERYWHERE. They are useful to pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers. Cost-effective use of technology has the potential to better manage the region's transportation system.
Put in as many pedestrian countdown signals as possible. They help the walkers AND the drivers, especially the drivers in order to reduce running red lights.
The rivers!!,, available and cheap picturesque and neglected.
This will help but building freeway capacity will make much more of a difference.
Use more flashing yellow turn signals!
Use the best data and behavioral studies. take the people out of driving as much as possible.
Most definitely make use of technology to make the network safer(red light and speeding cameras) and more efficient.
Allow Uber and other ride sharing to function uninhibited. Allow competitive transit instead of having a Trimet monopoly.

Digital signs indicating traffic jams, so drivers can avoid them.

Needs to be a holistic strategy to provide a useful transportation system including the road system while encouraging people to use alternative means of transportation to keep car use at a minimum.

Just because something is hi-tech doesn't mean it's good - make sure the tech actually improves things, but when it will, by all means do it!

Use applications and technology with proven track record. Negotiate strong contracts to hold parties accountable for outcomes, not just implementation.

Biggest bang for the buck. Safety, congestion, air quality and enforcement - all in one system.

Roundabouts.

Cost to lower middle and lower income families.

Real time information of commute times comparing differing modes of transportation (e.g. smart boards listing MAX, Freeway, and Bus route ETAs).

I support it if there can be a measurable impact. High tech signs and sensors are more expensive if they don't make an impact. I suggest investigating flex lane options where lanes on some high through put road and freeways may change direction in different conditions.

Make sure that the emergency response system is robust, including the trucks that can come and help people with their breakdowns and fender benders. Post signs at regular intervals with the numbers to call so you don't overload 9711.

Being used now with GPS systems showing traffic slowdowns; implement active signaling controls to address instant congestion.

I do not believe transit should have priority at intersections. The other ideas are worth doing.

I do not favor giving transit priority. I believe that pedestrians should have priority as they are unprotected from weather.

AS LONG AS IT DOES NOT INFLUENCE MY PERSON RIGHT TO PRIVACY, BECAUSE OF CRIME!!

The reader boards alerting drivers to traffic problems are a good investment.

Tech can make the transportation system more fluid and better. But we need to make sure there are goals when implementing the Tech. If goals are not met, then funding isn't done or is lowered.

Tech/system management to make flow of traffic better.

Accidents need to be cleared quickly so more accidents do not occur as the result.

As we are working toward reducing our usage of fossil fuel, we need to beef up mass transportation.

Common sense.

Cost.
Give pedestrians higher priority at controlled intersections.

How rapidly technology advances and changes. Need to develop/purchase a system that is easily integrated and capable of upgrading without causing a shut down of services. Security would also be a big issue since hacking a transportation system could cause traffic chaos.

I like smart intersections and stop lights; it's a good use of technology.

I prefer better countdown pedestrian signals & better traffic signal timing. Yes, breakdowns do need to be removed quickly so traffic isn't as delayed. Which vehicles get priority @ signals? Police, fire, ambulance, (for 5 minute response times) or public transit? This policy needs to be carefully considered. Emergency services takes precedence over public transit.

Improving traffic flow to reduce idling and emissions.

It seems very unnecessary to close down a road for hours to investigate accidents. Traffic signals need to be much better synchronized.

It's all about use of resources....if we didn't spend so much on light rail construction and then subsidizing use, then we would have resources for dedicated bus lanes, upgrades to bus systems, for example.

Maintenance of systems so it works as it should.

Make sure TriMet has measure in place to handle more technology.

Need to keep those teckies busy.

Not a fan of pedestrian countdown signs. It is unlawful to leave a place of refuge once the countdown has begun, yet its purpose seems to be to tell the pedestrian whether he's really in danger or not when he breaks this law. The period of time when "don't walk" is flashing is for right-turns-on-red, not for daredevil pedestrians! Get rid of these. I am a huge fan of widespread video surveillance in public places, including red light cameras and the like. There is no expectation of privacy in public places. I want a video of the guy who stole my bike, for instance. Why can't I have that? And let's celebrate this enhancement! The sign should not say "This area is under video surveillance;" it should say "Say cheese! This area is under video surveillance."

Only wise investment. We do not need pedestrian countdown signs, some of the new info boards on freeways are totally unnecessary.

Pay more attention to traffic signals for bicyclist. Often times bicycles don't trigger the light and you are forced to go through a red or walk over and push the walk button.

Require within two years all cars have interfaces to these traffic control system... the manufacturers of vehicles to provide these as part of support of the system for all vehicles build after 1995.

Signal timing on 99E through Milwaukie, Oak Grove, Oregon City and Canby is atrocious.

Tech can be a big time asset in this area.
Technological solutions should be prioritized before capacity expansion, which almost always more expensive. Traffic lights should be demand responsive, giving longer/preferential greens when pedestrians/cyclists are present or to the street that has the longer queue of cars. Transit should be given signal priority region wide to reduce delays, reduce running costs, and speed up buses that would make them more attractive. Real time technology should be used to inform riders of which buses stop at which stops, when next buses arrive, and where they go, to make it easy to ride transit. Technology should also be used to inform drivers where parking is available and at what cost.

Technology is the way of our future. We need to embrace it and use it. Please make sure moral questions are asked in the use of technology. This is a new world to us and we need to be careful.

Technology when applied correctly should have a major impact.

That's tinkering at the edges. Invest in transit. Timing lights isn't going to do the heavy lifting for you.

The life cycle of a particular technology.

The technology exists, use it.

This investment is needed to manage our system. Should be a funding priority.

This was addressed with some of my previous comments. Clear, clean, and well marked safe roads, bike lanes, and sidewalks are imperative and whatever means necessary to monitor and maintain them are welcome. Implementing efficient technology to meet these needs is a must.

This would help make more efficient use of what we have.

Timing traffic signals to allow for pedestrians crossing and max/freight train road intersections.

Timing signals has been a big help. As a cyclist I have noticed it when they have made improvements (like on the 12th street I-84 overpass). I would need some demonstration on why upgrading pedestrian countdown signs would be helpful. Using technology to control congestion pricing (and encouraging mass-transit use) would be welcome.

Traffic lights all need to be on traffic flow sensors. Making vehicles sit needlessly for four minutes waiting for the signal to change with no oncoming traffic is just stupid. But the tech needs to be upgradeable as new monitoring systems come on line.

Unless that means more stupid freeway signs as with the new ones that don't seem to provide anything useful. How much was that brilliant expenditure?

Use technology to monitor traffic to reduce unnecessary waiting at controlled intersections.

Use the best software and hardware available for guiding and controlling traffic.

Accidents need to be cleared quickly so more accidents do not occur as the result.

Common sense.

Cost.

Cost.
Equitable distribution of benefits throughout the Trimet service area, with special attention to underserved areas. Conduct cost benefit analysis for each project before implementation. Do not implement technology that has not been tested and determined useful statistically and monetarily in a community or communities of equivalent size in the United States.

Equity.

Examples of great tech use: auto adjusting lights to keep green going as big trucks are approaching corner rather than have them heaving to sudden stop.

Give pedestrians higher priority at controlled intersections.

How rapidly technology advances and changes. Need to develop/purchase a system that is easily integrated and capable of upgrading without causing a shut down of services. Security would also be a big issue since hacking a transportation system could cause traffic chaos.

I don't know but this is very important!

Improving traffic flow to reduce idling and emissions.

It is best to take into consideration the cost because if the cost is too high, the consumers pay more thereby making the cost of living unbearable.

Maintenance of systems so it works as it should.

More censor (non timed) traffic lights at intersections.

Not a fan of pedestrian countdown signs. It is unlawful to leave a place of refuge once the countdown has begun, yet its purpose seems to be to tell the pedestrian whether he's really in danger or not when he breaks this law. The period of time when "don't walk" is flashing is for right-turns-on-red, not for daredevil pedestrians! Get rid of these. I am a huge fan of widespread video surveillance in public places, including red light cameras and the like. There is no expectation of privacy in public places. I want a video of the guy who stole my bike, for instance. Why can't I have that? And let's celebrate this enhancement! The sign should not say "This area is under video surveillance;" it should say "Say cheese! This area is under video surveillance."

Only wise investment. We do not need pedestrian countdown signs, some of the new info boards on freeways are totally unnecessary.

Promote faster traffic flow.

Signal timing on 99E through Milwaukie, Oak Grove, Oregon City and Canby is atrocious.

Tante cose.

Tech may solve some problems, but so does no-tech and low-tech: good urban planning, neighborhood support, balanced-income "full-service" neighborhoods, etc.
Technology should absolutely be used, but not to make it more convenient to drive cars. Implementation of congestion tolling needs to happen, as does signalling giving priority to bicycle riders, transit and pedestrians. If it is possible to reducing emissions and idling without negatively impacting more desirable travel modes than private autos, then it should be done; however, if there is a choice between using technology to give a rapid transit line or a cycle-track priority at a signal, or to speed cars through the same signal to reduce idling, then the choice should be made considering what sorts of long-term travel behavior we wish to insensitivize in the region (hint, it’s not maintaining the auto-centered policies of the status-quo).

Technology to manage the existing transportations system unless it is combined it with building new roads, streets and highways.

That the "Street fee" is completely bogus.

That's tinkering at the edges. Invest in transit. Timing lights isn't going to do the heavy lifting for you.

The best technology is between your ears. In congested traffic drivers who travel at steady pace use less fuel. Observe drivers are stopped. Driver floors the throttle and jumps ahead AS IF TRAFFIC WILL CONTINUE AT FASTER PACE. Instead traffic stops ahead in a few hundred meters so driver hard breaks. They move like inche worms. Who is thinking about this insanity that consumes oxygen that bicyclists can not use. Butterflies can't breath either. How can you educate folks to look ahead and moderate throttle rather than jackrabbit starts-stops. Insane. Wears out pavement too.

The timing of traffic lights on heavily used corridors in Wa. County is a joke. Murray and TV Highway is a great example...it's simply broken. This can be solved with some effort and careful analysis of the timing problems.

There needs to be a master plan in place for review by the public before these new steps are put into place. No one has been "at the wheel" with the latest SE Division changes. The SE has become a hazardous maze of congestion and confusion. Someone needs to plan ahead.

This investment is needed to manage our system. Should be a funding priority.

This is the only item that I completely agree upon! No new taxes to support this though.

This would help make more effecient use of what we have.

Timing signals has been a big help. As a cyclist I have noticed it when they have made improvements (like on the 12th street I-84 overpass). I would need some demonstration on why upgrading pedestrian countdown signs would be helpful. Using technology to control congestion pricing (and encouraging mass-transit use) would be welcome.

Transit should have priority. Pedestrian walkways should be safe and allow the least fast cross safely.

Unless that means more stupid freeway signs as with the new ones that don't seem to provide anything useful. How much was that brilliant expenditure?

Use the best software and hardware available for guiding and controlling traffic.

Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 4:
Yes to public transit efficiency and safety; no to more hidden subsidies for autos.

Proper and competent engineering would be cheaper and more practical. Technology would only come into play as far as traffic light signal timings during peak commute hours on weekdays.

The idea is fine, but it should not use all the money needed for bikes and peds.

I am not impressed with new signs on the highway. They seemed to be placed in the wrong area...i.e. I have already been stopped in traffic for a while by the time I reach the sign.

I just don’t think there is much to do here. I see the new active road signs (so many minutes to route xxx). What am I supposed to do with this information? There are no alternate routes. I can’t go back and get my bike.

Most of the new technology I’ve seen put in place lately has been pretty, but useless.

The travel time signs are distracting and no help.

This does not alleviate emissions.

I do not understand what this means. Need examples.

Technology is overrated, especially when it is controlled and managed by people who have little respect for the intelligence of the average person using highways.

The point/use. For example on ramp lights are worthless --I don't see a difference between being parked on an on-ramp or stop & go on the highway. However, reader boards (if they were accurate) to warn of slow downs or the need to get off and go a different way are useful.

Those highway signs ODOT put all over Portland are serious DISTRACTIONS! Buses are welcome to be a part of all the rest of the traffic. Timing traffic lights would help on many of the roads I travel.

I will believe this when I see it work correctly. If traffic engineers haven’t been able to figure this out in the last 80 years, why should I believe they now know how.

It does not reduce traffic congestion enough to warrant the price of implementation.

Not as important as other things. Should be concentrating on decreasing the need for automobiles and also to keep the population of the region low.

Technology to manage transportation systems isn’t much of a help unless the arterials themselves are able to handle the traffic. 217 is a nightmare; the reader boards do NOTHING to alleviate the traffic congestion and overuse of the freeway.

These ideas are ridiculous. If you have extra money to throw around put it into the schools and quit raising my property tax.

Build MORE Roads! Spending money on new traffic monitoring signs and technology has proven to be a boondoggle.
This doesn't appear to be needed in our area at this time. It seems to function pretty well now. If the people in charge of managing these things do their job, we don't seem to need anything additional now. Recheck every year.

This money should be used instead to make public transit more usable.

We need to repairing the roads now and pay for by more gas tax, we use the roads and we need to pay for them.

This already seems to be pretty well managed.

I don't have an idea at this time; your explanation is not thorough enough for me.

ODOT wasted $10 million dollars on fancy info signs, which rarely provides correct information. Radio stations have been doing it for 60 to 70 years for free and their information is a lot more reliable.

Continue level of investment as is.

Forget this. Obviously governance is inventing ways to spend money.

It is fine as it is!

Of all the issues, this one is much lower in priority.

Too tied into the idea of car.

Things already work pretty well. I see no immediate need for more of these things.

YES I support efficiency using technology to properly and efficiently time traffic signals, clear crashes ect... BUT I support Doing this withing the current budget you already have! YOU DON'T NEED MORE!

Already being done but could be improved. ODOT trucks are not being utilized as well as they could be.

Current level is acceptable.

I would support this as long as transit does not have "priority" at intersections. This is just another way for government to "nudge" us into riding transit rather than using cars. The lights are set to cause the most disruption, freeway on ramps are monitored when they don't need to be, (i.e. lanes that run from one exit to the next without requiring a merge), accidents are used to shut down the freeways completely while the accident is "investigated". There is no way that crashes will be cleared more quickly as long as the transportation policy is intended to get us out of our cars and force us to walk or ride a bicycle.

Other things are more important.

We need to make an honest evaluation of benefits from systems already in place (ramp meters that are rarely on or other metered ramps with huge back-ups, electronic signs with spurious messages (like click it or ticket) that only succeed in slowing traffic as drivers read the message, and do I really need to know it is "X" minutes to some key point when traffic is moving a highway speeds?

Investment should be in alternative transportation systems.
After ODOT put up their fancy freeway signs, I’m not impressed by any more technology spending. Also, Transit should have the same priority as everyone else. NO special lanes. Improve the roads, so we all get where we need to go in a shorter amount of time.

If you are referring to light rail-No Build more roads and consider a bus system.

Timing traffic signals should not be that expensive. Giving preference to transit is unfair. Just like Tualatin gives preference to trucks. It sucks! Makes residents hate truckers. If you have enough roads you won’t have to slow down traffic.

We have cameras, talking walk signs and blinking lights for bicyclists - Tualatin has enough technology on the road for autos.

The timing lights at the end of ramps only cause pollution as cars are forced to stop and then speed up.

My observation is that freeway ramp signals, and other high tech machinery make travel slower. technology is not always the answer. new ODOT reader-board signs are a menace.

A waste of money. Use that money for road maintenance.

I think other things are more important. But for heaven's sake, get rid of those new left turn signals that blink and go back and forth from yellow to green. They are counter to all training and I'm getting tired of seeing accidents and near misses because they are so confusing.

The value of technology is grossly overrated and priced. Using what should be common sense and getting people out of cars is a much cheaper alternative. We won't need this expensive traffic management if we can get employers to allow office workers to work 2-3 days from home.

What is an example is unreliable.

While more spending here would be great, I think dollars could be better spent elsewhere considering the existing system isn't being utilized well at this time. Improve what they have now before adding more to it.

DO NOT GIVE TRANSIT PRIORITY.

Not enough information about costs and advantages, if any. This might be another million dollar boondoggle.

Traffic light signals can be adjusted without spending money.

Ya causing cars to idle at lights increases emissions, that's another brilliant strategy.

Nearly half of congestion will removed. Get real, don't help that much now, too much feel good stuff!

The new electronic reader boards that ODOT recently installed are a total waste and often slow traffic more as people read them. Technology can be great when used effectively, but it seems more often to be an experiment to see how it will work than actually working.

I would but I think this is a financial black hole with millions spent on unproven technologies.

Not if it is used to further automobile dominance.

I chose no here because I feel the only thing needed here is to improve the timing of traffic signals to improve traffic flow.
Once again we see a recent display of government ineptitude in the recent use of technology. The electronic reader boards and speed signs on the area's highways have been a horrible waste of money. They add no help for drivers and serve only to distract drivers. Those millions of dollars wasted could have been better spent on additional transit lanes.

Not a cost effective way of spending transportation dollars.

Some technology improvements might be ok, but many projects seem overpriced for resulting value or usage.

ITS is touted for being able to move more people and freight in a confined space. This is all well and good in computer modeling, but loses everything when distracted drivers, bike riders, or pedestrians introduce the human factor to the equation.

MAX screws up the traffic light timing, so why bother?

Money should go to public transit—not to encourage more car/truck traffic.

The "advisory speeds" now in place on I-405 and I-5 are a waste of money.

The advisory speed signs on 405 and 5 are a waste of money and out of sync.

There is little benefit for non-automobile users.

These technologies should only be implemented if they can be cost-saving. Millions should go to public transit and pedestrian experiences first, before they get funneled away to large capital projects that only benefit users of highways.

How technology has worked in other regional bodies - my tally says the odds are poor!

I don't know how technology will help really. I am a firm believer that we need to reduce technology in most areas of our lives.

I don't think enough information is provided here on what "technology" is being proposed here, and there is no sense of the relative cost of technology.

I was torn on this Yes/No. The technology choices listed above should include traffic enforcement cameras. I am very much in favor of more red light cameras and more speed enforcement cameras. An idea to make cameras more palatable to the public: send some of the fines collected to drivers who do not speed or blow through red lights. I recall reading that a city somewhere in Europe is trying this and it has been successful at getting public buy-in for more traffic enforcement cameras.

I'm pretty happy with what we have now, and think money saved here could be used for other transportation priorities.

It is not reasonable to say support technology. Technology is a tool to support other outcomes. Technology can apply to any goal, so approaching policy this way obscures the most important aspect of choice.

Sounds like a boondoggle.
There are a lot more cost effective options for reducing emissions that the region has not yet implemented. Better technology is a good option for the future but there is lower hanging fruit the region should implement first.

There is enough tech stuff out there but if the system in is disrepair and unsafe tech stuff won't solve it.

These things are fine as is. The countdowns are misleading and confusing - one cannot tell if they will get to 0 and the light change or start again at 9.

This doesn't seem to make that much of a difference.

Have fewer cars on the road. Consider carsharing. Increase non-automobile options.

See previous answer.

Technology can not replace biodiversity and common sense. Technology is great at deconstructing personal connections and community.

I support all of these propositions except "giving transit priority at intersections." We have already destroyed the traffic flow at many intersections for nearly empty street cars to pass by.

I support using the money already in the budget for maintaining the roads, this is what is most important at this time. Seems like DOT would have already figured out how to time the lights. How much would this cost?

Actual benefit, and other more relevant improvements to those who need them most.

Again, I support some of this, but I think that the repair of the roads should come first. There are roads in outer SE that are not paved. Do you know that between 52nd and 39th to the south of Woodstock, there are sections where there is not a paved road that runs East o West for 10 blocks?

I support pedestrian countdown signs, and transit priority but not the rest.

Where the money would come from for this is not addressed.

I don't actually think technology is the key in managing our transportation system though it may be a tool on helping to decide priorities and maintaining an inventory base. If a person wants technology to help navigate the road system that's fine, but when it comes to a route needing work eyes on the road is still the key.

This can be done without the level of wasteful spending you are positing for the other items in this survey. Without removing debt from our public spending, our system will collapse.

"Do you want to spent more of your stolen taxpayer dollars to do wonderful things because we don't want to mention the pitfalls of it because then the poll results may not skew towards the answers we want?" Dumb ass question writers.

This should be a lower priority than making non-car forms of transit more convenient to the average citizen.

Already adequate.

Fancier equipment won't make up for unsafe roadways.

I think we have plenty of signage today, but cleaning up crashes quickly on major highways is an area of improvement.
If there are the resources, this is great, but it's important to focus on the basics.

It seems to me that there is adequate technology in place now. Could it be better? Sure. Do I think this should be funded over the other issues listed here? No. If there’s enough $ to go around then, by all means, spend some of it here!

These technological fixes seem to cost way more than the benefits that they provide. I love the bike traffic signals, but more thoughtful intersection and crosswalk design alone could do what they do. Transit should definitely have the priority at intersections, as should pedestrians, but again, I would want low-tech solutions explored before we invest in lots of technology.

This is in place and adequate.

This type of investment should be a lower priority than constructing new pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities.

These sorts of improvements may be obsolete with autonomous vehicles on the horizon. even if they are not, they should be done after bike/ped connections as they don't have the return on investment that better active transportation connections would.

This is a good idea but I think other options should be a higher priority.

See previous answer. ITS is useful for enabling other modes (transit, bike) to bypass congestion, but alleviating congestion will only reduce the time cost of travel, encouraging more people to drive.

Again, are pricey high-tech toys the best solution?

Common sense should take priority over technology. Some of the stupid traffic circles and blocked streets cause more problems than through streets with good lights or stop signs.

Metro spends too many community resources on planning. The approach on this should be to categorize intersections by number of crashes and near misses, fix the worst ones and monitor the changes for effectiveness.

Should be implemented as the technology becomes affordable.

Tech won't save us when the grid goes down. Stick to simple solutions and accepted risk and responsibility - like traffic circles; we have to hold up our part and get along to make it work.

We already have technology but it isn’t used wisely. Why can 2 1/2 cars go through a signal on 39th & Hawthorne and nine cars go through one at 39th & Burnside. It is not smart thinking.

We're already using technology to actively manage the transportation system, and it seems to be working just fine. Why is this a policy at all? No other policy specifies how to accomplish a goal, it just specifies the goal, such as "actively manage the transportation system to improve efficiency and give priority to transit."

Less supportive of this.

Our current levels of technology are adequate and in line with most metropolitan areas. There is no need to be on the bleeding edge here.
Though I support using technology as much as possible to increase the efficiency of the transportation system, I don't feel that the priority of this would lead to yet more needing to be spent on this.

What more needs to be invested. Are the current systems not working?

You can't even remove abandoned cars from the streets and replace missing street signs. Why should we trust you with technology? But more to the point, why are even asking this? As a major metropolitan area, why aren't the lights already timed on major thoroughfares? Eugene has timed lights. Meanwhile, Portland has bioswells in rich neighborhoods and cameras at the lights in the poor neighborhoods.

We already do this well.

Cost. This is a waste of money.

I do not see the value of most of the signs and technology used thus far in our transit system.

Shut down the Street Cars and Make Crime-Met pay their own way.

Technology in this capacity is only useful for automotive traffic. We should be investing in safety and active and public transportation. Reducing congestion and delay is just a way to make it more convenient for people to drive around. We should do the opposite and make it less convenient for people to drive around, thereby reducing the number of people driving, and making our streets safer and and really reducing air pollution and toxins.

This stuff is pretty cool and it's important to keep traffic flowing as close to optimally as possible. Not my highest priority though.

While I agree this needs to be done, I would encourage use of improved management patterns in street design rather than reliance on technology. For example, traffic circles have been proven to improve traffic flow more than timed street lights.


I abhor the big brother approach to transportation management. Resist. the only thing I like are streetlights that have sensors to change to green when a car comes in the non-domaanant direction. I also think that meters on onramps should default to green not red.

I have seen very little value in the signage alerting drivers to travel time... it seems to want drivers to reroute themselves when warned of traffic jams, but since there is no alternative to existing routes in our freeway network, the warning is useless.

I particularly don't like the OC MAX line having priority over buses. Also don't need talking pedestrian signals. Don't need highway signs that tell how long it will take to reach destination.

I think this is a lesser priority - it is needed but we already do invest in this and at the current level we can manage for a while longer. I feel there are more pressing needs.

It is a waste of money.
Not until all streets are paved!
Only once all streets are paved and there are sidewalks throughout Portland.
Technology is good however I do not want that investment to be made before the concrete and asphalt is put down to enable folks to actively use their own street network to accomplish most trips without the use of a car.
The new signs that ODOT installed indicating travel times are a waste of money. The advisory travel speeds are only slightly more useful. Spend the money on safety rather than management.
The return on investment from technology of this kind has not been demonstrated sufficiently.
We have so much technology now, and when it doesn’t work, it’s a major inconvenience. I’m not sure that throwing more money at tech is going to get us a significant return.
Do not confuse things and increase idling by giving transit priority. People from out of town already hate visiting Portland because of the mess created down town.
Giving transit and bikes priority is important, but I don't think that current system needs any more resources in terms of signage, signals for cars, or clearing crashes.
I think that there are other ways that we could better spend our money.
Save money and energy for important things.
Things are OK as they are.
I think that there are other ways that we could better spend our money.
Timing traffic signals, removing breakdowns quickly and pedestrian countdown signs, yes. Transit should flow with traffic.
We already appear to do this.
Already have sufficient systems in place. There are other higher priorities.
More investment? I thought we're already doing this.
Not a bad thing, but I would prioritize investment in transit, walking and biking infrastructure instead.
Technology and government usually means we pay way too much for what we get, Cover Oregon, Portland Water Bureau billing process, FBI virtual case file system... Please leave this to the private sector, and those who have to be efficient.
That's a soft "no, I don't support more investment...." Do not spend on technology for the sake of spending on technology. Invest where it is the best solution, not when it's sexy. For instance, the advisory signs on 217 are silly, inaccurate and not helpful at all. Those were a waste of money.
The new sign and reader boards on 217 and nearby highways are pointless. That project was a make work waste of taxpayer money. It has zero effect on traffic.
Too expensive, doesn't really work. Just more toys for ODOT and Portland Transportation department is not what we need!

We need less technology interfering with organic traffic flow. Eliminate all traffic signals in favor of roundabouts.

What we have works well enough, this stuff just provides more distracting signage and more cell phone use while driving.

Yes and know. The countdown signs are good, but the new freeway signs are useless. A driver can't go the advised speeds - it's either too fast, or too slow for traffic flow.

Changing the turn lane signals to flash yellow like Tigard did was smart...the stupid and always wrong time signs ODOT just put up are worse than worthless...they slow things down and are always wrong.

Do not give transit priority at intersections. I'm sick of being held up at railway crossings so that a WES train with 1 person on it can go by.

If technology includes the new digital signs indicating how long it takes to reach a major intersection or how fast you should travel, that isn't helping. Invest money in widening the highways and freeways. Keep traffic moving. That is the key.

If you are talking about those new multimillion dollar signs on the freeways...hell no...they could not be more wrong most of the time...but our phones are right....how can that be....in competence by government i guess.

Those new traffic signs are never right yet...but like in Tigard where at turns they have flashing yellow arrows...that helps and should be used elsewhere.

But only because I need to see data the indicates that the technology that is already in place to ease traffic (i.e. the suggested speed signs along the freeways) has been effective enough to justify the costs. Since this sort of policy has already been implemented recently, I would rather see one of the other prior policies receive some attention.

I can't see what good it does to know that it's going to take you 7 minutes vs. 5 minutes to get to I-5 except to make you more anxious about every minute. It's good to know if there is a major accident if there's an opportunity to take a different route but usually there isn't. I think the limited funds should be put into basic infrastructure and the added technology is just a frill.

I'm satisfied with the current way this is handled.

Some of this is fine, like timing traffic signals more efficiently and clearing crashes quickly, but technology tends to be expensive. For example, the newly installed speed and notification signs on OR-217 are basically useless. I have never found them to be accurate. Focus our budget on services and maintenance for the things we know work.
What isn't working with current system with timed stop lights for transit and private vehicles? At some point, we all are no longer able to manage buses and bikes and will need a car. This type of preferential approach is punitive.

Spend money on alternative transit options instead of managing existing roads.

The traffic lights in Portland are timed wrong it is obvious to me or anyone that has lived here for any time... I in the 80's could drive Sandy, Powell, Lombard at 25 at 11 am on a Sunday and make every light or I could do the same at 50... I tested it.. Now I cant make it 4 lights at any given time... I think the leaders of our area really like pollution because there is some underlying need to slow traffic... Sam Adams said it did it and thats what causes traffic problems and more accidents is people wanting to be the last one through a short light.

Cover Oregon. The technology won't work.

Do not give transit priority.

I'd rather there be aggressive action to reduce traffic overall -- reduce environmental pollution, climate change. Transit should definitely have priority at intersections.

Little incentive here for people to leave their cars.

Planners make things worse.

This is not a bad idea, but I would rate it at a lower priority, because I think our transit issues stem from insufficient road capacity and parking capacity, not from lack of technology. One possible exception, if large parking structures would appear near downtown, would be smart garages that indicate how many places are available on signs that are on the thoroughfares, not just at the entrances of parking lots; this is commonly done in European cities.

Too costly.

We are not needing technology. We need more roads to get people to their destinations faster. Transit makes it take more time, not less.

Only if voted on by public living in area of change.

These items are expensive and rarely accomplish what they are supposed to do. Stop trying to control traffic and just let it flow.

Not sure I trust this to be well managed.

This is a clever way of saying "giving transit priority at intersections" making driving privately owned vehicles as inconvenient as possible.

Unless you can find an inexpensive way to meld technology into the infrastructure. It seems the State and Metro can not find someone, or group of someones, that actually has success in this area. (Health care?)

Prioritize lower cost investments in active transportation systems over implementation of costly technology.
Technology is overstated as a solution to problems. Rather use good human-scaled design. For example: Nothing is more obscene that cities using cameras in speed traps. It is easy to use/blame technology instead of addressing the underlying bad blueprint for suburban sprawl. Your examples of transportation system management are examples of reshuffling problems, not designing better solutions.

All the new cross walks are clogging roadways during high traffic. We have a serious problem on 122nd and Powell. And most ppl jay walk anyway. So much for all the money spent.

It's not that I don't see a benefit from technology. It's just that I believe we ought to invest first in the proven, low-cost safety issues that exist: 1) Finish putting in sidewalks and curbs in the unincorporated area between Gladstone and Milwaukie; and 2) Finish lighting McLoughlin in the same area. Get that done, people will be much safer, and then we can talk technology.

In short, it doesn't need it.

What was wrong with using common sense? That is when city govt had any, if ever.

Let's leave that to the DOT. At least where I live, lights are timed appropriately, and pedestrians have the necessary resources to get through safely.

Technological fixes are just bandaids. Continuing to use the same tools we've used for the last 75 years and expecting a different outcome is one definition of insanity.

"Transit priority at intersections"?? Currently in my neighborhood in unincorporated Clark County entire street corners with UNUSED wheelchair access already in place are being replaced with a more expensive upgrade. I do not agree with use of funds in areas unused with accommodations already in place.

I support the part about timing the traffic lights. less time at lights means less time idling your car.

If that means giving more money to TriMet to waste on outdated and useless technology then no.

Low priority. Or use technology to encourage carpooling.

NO TO TRANSIT PRIORITY ! YES TO SIGNAL TIMING AND CLEARING INCIDENTS.

Same old same old. Money wasted on transit time signs that are a traffic hazard (people slow to read them) and are wrong. How many $$$ were wasted on stupid signs? So what is the new "thing" and who gets the payoff?

This is a loaded question aimed only getting support for spending more money on transit as is this entire survey. Technology can not clear crashes. It can manipulate signals. Giving transit priority at intersections is completely out of balance.

Too much is being spent on technology and not enough on basic maintenance.

A waste of money.

Low priority. Or use technology to encourage carpooling.

Not as high a priority, except for giving transit priority at intersections.

See previous answer on new electronic highway signs.
198 Sounds like more bureaucracy.
199 The electronic signs are a waste of tax dollars. Traffic congestion is reported by radio and anyone with a GPS phone app.

200 This is a loaded question aimed only getting support for spending more money on transit as is is this entire survey. Technology can not clear crashes. It can manipulate signals. Giving transit priority at intersections is completely out of balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97004</td>
<td>Coordinated signals is great, but why should this cost very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97007</td>
<td>Making travel time consistent is the priority. It will make it easier for commuters to pick the most efficient mode of transportation rather than dealing so much with the worst case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97030</td>
<td>Rather than money we need an educated responsible population using our transit systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97034</td>
<td>In the rush to clear up crashes we are quite possibly not studying what led to the crashes. Perhaps it is road design or alignment. It would be useful if a &quot;311&quot; telephone service could report arrival of transit and know the delays due to road work or gridlock or crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Real-time gps in most cars and trucks would be cool, but I would really love to see transit be more resilient to hiccups in the system. I have spend countless hours of my life waiting for a bus or train that never came and/or made me very late getting to work or home. This is why I finally purchased a car despite my moral support for transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97202</td>
<td>This is hard considering our city's proclivity for ill-considered and wasted costs in the area of technology - so I would say there must be a strong focus on checking out tech upgrades before purchasing. I assume timing signals is already happening and maybe needs to be reviewed, like figuring out the bottlenecks - SE Cesar Chavez and Powell heading south is notorious for taking 3 lights to get the last 2 blocks to Powell. I'm not sure where clearing crashes and breakdowns can be that much helped by more technology. Transit priority already exists where it is most needed with MAX, even buses sometimes have a priority at some stops - SE Cesar Chavez and Belmont heading north - if the driver knows how to access it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97204</td>
<td>No everyone has easy access to tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97206</td>
<td>All the above are great ideas!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97211</td>
<td>Sure, if it really can help to avoid widening roads or building new capacity, then it seems like a good use of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97215</td>
<td>Capacity to move vehicles in reasonable timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97219</td>
<td>How much do the various options cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97223</td>
<td>Not sure if benefits are matched by costs. Would support if outcomes can be substantiated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use technology to manage parking. There is not such thing as free parking! Invest in occupancy sensors and price so that there will always be 80% vacancy. Use technology to charge a toll for minutes driven/entering and exiting key areas of the city. Use this revenue to improve the quality of life for all portlanders.

Keep looking for improvement strategies.

Love pedestrian countdown signs. Since bikes have priority and pedestrians have priority, I don’t understand why people in cars who pay for the roads with their gas taxes don’t get at least parity with SOMETHING.

I would need more data to determine if I support this.

If it's demonstrated elsewhere to be cost-effective and increase safety. Be very cautious about spending money to install new, previously untested systems. Be specific about what benefits are expected and track whether or not they are achieved.

Dumb question. Too vague. Who opposes improvements in theory?

Maintain current levels of investment.
5. Do you support more investment by your community and our region to provide information and incentives to expand the use of travel options?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7236</td>
<td>Please do informational meetings and send out notices to residents to get their opinions and suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>I'd just like to see more people use public transit. But I'm not sure how we can convince Americans (who are bonded to their cars!) to use it more often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Limited investment in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surfaces, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97004</td>
<td>While it is good for the public to do these things more, it would be BAD if this option used up the money needed for actually making biking and walking safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>A website?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>As a mom of young children, I find it more challenging than ever before in my life to use transportation other than my car. Between all the diaper bags, how tired kids get (and how tired I get carrying them), and that it takes 2-3 times longer to ride the bus or lightrail just makes it hard to make that choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Build on way finding, route planning tools already in the market. Provide tax incentives? (some benefit/issues) for improved and functional bike parking in commercial areas and apartment/condo complexes. Keeping bikes safe, secure,(dry) and in highly visible areas may reduce barriers to more people riding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Financial incentives are ways to spur people to change their habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Increasing options for low income workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Make trimet a free service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Pay people to bike and walk - it's a great investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97006</td>
<td>Better signage on trails for directions and distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97006</td>
<td>Employer paid transportation or if apartment communities are built without access to parking a bus pass should be given, or cost shared by the developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97006</td>
<td>Employers need to be on board with this to provide opportunity and flexibility (and perhaps incentive) to make carpooling type things more accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97006</td>
<td>Get people into better run mass transit. This includes better security on MAX (I gave up riding after being accosted on a loading platform), especially after dark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97006</td>
<td>I think that people have to be informed about a topic a few times before it sinks in. As for incentives, I support measures that encourage people to reconsider habits such as hopping into their cars to run a single errand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let car owners pay extra for using their cars and spread that extra money as incentives towards non-car users. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income for incentives? Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Look at the modes of travel for the area considered.

Only if it does not take away the rights of those who own cars and if there are reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

This seems like a good idea—but I think it will be a hard sell as long as private cars are soooo easy and cheap to use.

Who is the target? Commuters and students are the ones needing more travel options. We could stop building roads and that certainly would be an incentive to travel in new ways.

Yes to public transit, walking and bicycling. In this day and age, any urban-area and suburban-area road should include sidewalks, and any road that has anything called "peak time traffic" should include bike lanes.

Yes, in a small way. Unless the price of gas doubles, the convenience of the personal auto will keep most people from using these alternates. So, while I support the idea in theory, I don't think there will many new converts. I do support raising gas taxes greatly.

Adding parking structures and perhaps more locations for long-term parking for public transit users could add the number of people who ride who are not within walking distance of transit.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

Bike boxes at intersections and green paint on the pavement for complicated right-of-ways is good. Signs that educate motorists regarding bicycle right-of-ways would be helpful.

But this seems to be a much lower priority than the other categories.

Collaborative effort between private and public.

How to provide for the greatest number of end users at the best cost.

I believe the current level of available information is optimal.

Make sense.

Many people are averse to ride-sharing, valuing their independence, I suppose. But information on all the above options, frequently updated and prominently displayed, can't hurt.

More dedicated bike roads, paths, trails, etc.

Much more needs to be done in the area of car sharing, carpools and vanpools. Also look at more HOV lanes.

Raise the gas tax.

See answers to previous questions.
The annual MAX pass that I get from my employer is like a golden ticket...saves me $2500/ yr and nearly 8500 miles I don't drive. When balanced against the catastrophe of climate collapse, free public transit will look like a steal on the terrible day we realize we've passed a point of no return.

Use social media to make car pooling safer with strangers.

High gas prices apparently aren't incentive enough. More needs to be done to lower the pollution from cars and noise from traffic.

However do not raise our taxes for these things you all seem to love raising taxes since it is not your money.

No opinion.

The powers that be i.e. Governor and his staff, mayor and his staff, city commissioners should set the example by riding the max, bus and biking every where they need to go. Don't expect the unwashed masses to something that their leaders are unwilling to do.

This should be given a larger share of the resources than in previous years.

Add incentives for employers to allow workers to work from home as much as possible and there is a win-win available for the taking.

Central dispatch computer for public to access and sign up.

First priority is safety. Drivers and co-riders need to know that the vehicle in which they are riding is safe, and that the occupants with whom they sit are safe as well.

Potential is the key word. What has Really happened another places and here.

Info about willamette valley ride share online got me out of my car and into a vanpool...less expensive than driving, less stressful and better for the environment.

I think Portland currently does an extremely good job providing these services.

Yes, spend money to provide information about travel options, but let's not overdo it.

More connections for public transportation.

Proper advertising and informational materials.

We already have the info, we just need to be smart enough to use it!

However, pools have never caught on or worked very well. We must concentrate more on modern public trans options, like in Europe.

More room for bikes on transit and on cars for sharing.

Tax rebates and stipends for those who use public transportation.

This policy should be given high priority.

You're going to have to make the info eye catching; people will tune out quickly and continue to do what they always do.

Don't need incentives...people who want to do this will do so without the tax payer having to dig any deeper.

I am skeptical of carsharing, carpools & vanpools. Much more computer rail is needed.
I particularly like variations of carpooling. However, the government needs to get out of the way and permit the private sector to develop the infrastructure to make ridesharing by private parties as convenient as possible - transit and taxi interests be damned.

Information about these alternatives is fine, but I object to incentives paid for by the tax payers that actually already save the users money.

Most effective marketing techniques to reach the greatest number of potential participants.

Population growth projections, financial incentives through employers, more and physically separate bike lanes.

Tax incentives for not driving alone in a car. Free, secure parking for bikes in business districts. Subsidized transit passes.

The least amount of effort should be put into implementing any solutions involving cars and trucks. Focus instead on pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transportation like buses.

As I said earlier, we should do everything we can to get cars (particularly single-occupant) off the road, with as many people biking and walking as possible, and the rest using transit. Also I’d like to point out that electronic bikes (e-bikes) are quite popular in other countries (particularly in Europe and Asia), and this technology should be promoted as a viable transit option for certain trips/segments of the population.

Carpool/vanpool/sharing programs need to be more pervasive and easy to step into... Transit could be taken a step further to small bus routes that target commuters on popular routes that the larger TriMet buses do not/cannot serve. Provide workplace grants for vanpooling.

For the people who don't need the auto for work this would be good.

Looking out for long distance commuting from the suburbs to other parts of town, not just to downtown.

Sounds like a place to begin the discussion on the hassle of driving in the Portland Metro area.

Technology is already helping with car pooling options eg. uber and zipcar. The government should look at drafting policies to encourage these services.

A tax break for using public transpo or other non-car methods.

Depends on how logical in Metro area.

Do this in a way that reaches a lot of people with reasonable investment - that is don't over do it. As the transit system improves spend more resources letting people know about. Call it the transit awesomeness to braggingness ratio.

Electric car plug-ins, expanding zip cars to the suburbs.

Guard against un-licensed car-share operations.

I like the idea of having more carless areas.

Need more bus routes that can be in more areas and be more cost effective.
Not to punish those without an option - say driving to work during hours and areas there is no other access and implementing a highway tax.

People need to be aware of their options for alternative transportation (biking, bussing, etc).

perhaps a better network of ridesharing opportunities.

The best incentive is probably getting people to realize the cost savings and convenience of alternate transportation.

The use of technology should help with such

This is an inexpensive way to save on fuel, pollution, enhance safety. More roundabouts!

This is only partially helpful for those of us on the edges of the UGB. Yes, getting more people on public transit, walking, biking will make our commute better, but we still need a better parking strategy with the parking structures located more evenly around the city.

This makes workers save time and gas when traveling to their jobs.

That this is not new, has been tried before, and only a limited part of the population will use travel options. A "big" change is needed with "big" incentives. Only a few are inspired to change because it is the right thing to do; most need "what's in it for me" incentives.

Businesses that hire workers at a specific location all day should be targeted.

Provide education.

Making public transit appear more inviting. No one wants to stand in the rain waiting half an hour for a bus that is steamy and smelly.

The world lives on technology, being out front is important to keep people informed and get info out in mades quickly.

Don't know.

Get the information out and market this strategy. It will work but it must be handled right, positive, and the public needs information on this program.

Low cost.

Reduced parking fees for carpooling, & above, vehicles.

This would be the last item I would invest $ in.

Yes..BUT! (yes, always a "but"!) FIRST the Oregon insurance commissioner needs to change the rules. Car sharing, or even ride-sharing, leads to a deeeeeeep! hole in the liability system, and it needs to be spelled out that, for example, someone who contributes "gas money" is not a "commercial hire" and the one who accepts the "gas money" is not a "commercial vendor". A member of my family "car-pooled" for several years until our insurance agent told us that, as a "tit-for-tat" driver, we were, in law, engaged in a "commercial" enterprise and our non-commercial insurance would not cover us in the event that anyone in our car, OR OTHERS involved, were injured or had property damage. FIX THAT!
Businesses see where the weaknesses are for mass transit commuting. Offer to assist with monthly mass transit pass. Perhaps local food establishments can offer percentage discount when showing a bus pass. City can help get workers to take care of errands/dental appts and so forth by connecting them to these services during their lunch.

I don't know but getting information to the right people at the right time is very important .... communication as well as transportation go hand in hand.

Interconnected bikeways that are also walkways. Better mass transit into the suburbs, especially into Tualatin and Wilsonville beyond rush hour times. Do they think we don’t go anywhere or want to go anywhere during the day or in the evening? Traffic might be a lot better if people like me could get downtown during the day without having to leave with the commuters, or in the evening when we would love to go downtown for dinner and drinks.

Of course. I've been pushing for a 'eHarmony' like webpage backed by W-4 data from the State showing how many people live close to me and work close to where I work. It would allow one person (who was looking to carpool) to send postcards to others who were possible candidates for carpooling to explore their options. Call me: 503.691.9530

Perhaps good access to information via social media.

Please bring back/institute HOV lanes, at least at rush hour times.

The needs of the disabled and older folks who can no longer drive--or shouldn't be driving--and not just for workers.

Yes but information is the most important. I believe if you build good paths, and people know about them, they will use them.

Yes, however, I believe it to be weak and somewhat futile. Economic and development regulations favor travel alone by car. Period. No amount of ads or brochures or exhorting carpooling above and beyond what I've seen and heard is going to overcome that. For someone who is interested in riding transit, they'll simply use google or go to www.trimet.org for the info they need. Make a token effor for this policy, and spend more time and effort on the other policies.

Carsharing is not possible on all routes, it seems as if people are already informed. MAX goes to Hillsboro and people use it to commute but the southern suburbs, where there are not clear work commute routes, are harder to serve. A subscription service like airport vans might be an option here.

Enforce traffic laws on bicycle riders. They disregard traffic control lights, one-way streets, traffic lanes - you name it - bicycle riders thumb their noses at all traffic regulations. Bicycles should require licenses AND LIABILITY INSURANCE. Improve carsharing, carpools and van pools.

Get the idiots in Portland to approve uber.
I support new dedicated funding for active transportation. It is important to take off as many trip from our road network as possible by using active transportation. Metro should lead by example by dedicating all eligible flexible federal funding to active transportation projects and using estimated climate benefits to determine which projects should be prioritized.

Limited resources for this option.

Reduce the regulations on taxi cabs. In Washington D.C., cabs are everywhere and there is no need for a car because you can easily connect from rail to a cab to your final destination.

Travel options will need to be convenient and affordable.

You'll get much better participation and a happier public with "HONEY" than by trying to shove "vinegar" down their throat.

Allow Uber in the metro area.

Availability at time of day connectivity cost #1 consideration.

I support additional information, but not sure about incentives.

Information should be at every library in the region.

Install HOV lane with congestion tolls as along Utah's Wasatch Front (between Ogden and Provo). Adopt congestion tolls during rush hour, as is currently done in London and Stockholm. We have had the technology for more than 40 years but not the political will.

Local businesses could partner w/transit to provide "perks" (free soda, 15% off purchase, etc.) for riders who showed a pass stamped with that days' ride to that businesses' area. Also, an incentive to walk could be as simple as having many well-placed, safe, sheltered benches for walkers to rest. Van- and car-pools need their own "diamond lane" on the freeway. On toll roads, they could get free passage.

Mandated employer sponsored programs with monetary incentives to encourage workers to use other means that driving to work.

Public awareness is good - but you need to have a good product to market. Make travel options part of the planning process early on in any transportation project or construction.

What is working today and why? My husband loves the bus/WES and his employer pays for the monthly pass so the company gets a green credit. Great for all. The bus/WES takes twice as long to and from work, so the dollar incentive is important for us as a family.

Balance the funds between autos and alternative options.

Energy efficient and environmentally safe transportation.

I would be more inclined to car pool or use transit if incentives were an option. Taking transit requires more time than driving, and my time is valuable.

See other responses.

This is the key.
At this time Eastern Multnomah County, Gresham, and Sandy would stand to benefit from incentives and more info in this regard. Surveying the needs in each area would be helpful to determine each community’s desires and specific needs.

My initial reaction is to reject government incentives. However, there is a large percentage of our population that deserves support from the government.

Need to come up with new ideas. I don’t have any and carpool/vanpool, walking and bike info has already been tried. Keep it up, and good luck. Maybe start with the schools and start folks walking, biking and taking transit early.

Providing incentives in areas where people aren’t taking advantage of carpooling, carsharing etc. Sadly, people are selfish and we will never get them to easily go to carpooling systems. People who are already aware are probably already using or have used public transit as much as they can.

Get people out of cars as much as possible. When that reaches its limit, get them to share cars. Incentives are needed, what about free or reduced parking rates, and reserved places downtown?

Make it cost effective.

Reducing frequency and quantity of business and personal trips.

Availability.

Cost effectiveness of communication. Many people will not be able (or willing) to use alternatives.

Encourage, but don’t punish or force people.

How about incentives for companies that allow telecommuting, working from home?

Better than widening street, eliminate the one-person auto ride as something usual and acceptable.

Make transit free and plentiful bike parking.

People need reasons and incentives to change current behavior. A few bucks or attaboys could go a long way.

Do this without increasing costs to people who do not benefit from these.

Use paper collateral only in places where a single flyer can be viewed by many. i.e. a community bulletin board. Otherwise, get word out electronically, through radio and TV announcements, at tabling events.

Education is important but definitely not enough. Many people know that carpooling, ride sharing, public transit is a good idea, but still don’t do it. You need to really investigate what incentives would motivate people to actually make a change.

Getting people to the major bus routes is important especially during inclement weather.

Make public transportation faster. Make walkways and bikeways more safe (lighting, maintenance). People will come. Quality systems do not require incentives to draw users.

Target companies with large employee base more, like Intel or Maxim.

Communication is always important. It should not be too flashy - but facts and helpful ideas.
Cost! Use taxation to lower the direct price of mass transit in order to maximize how many people choose it. Raise parking prices, too.

I would focus more on safe walking and biking routes than carpools.

Incentives, perhaps. Info probably not necessary. People that want or need it will find it.

Information - yes. Incentives? Not so sure. The biggest bang for the buck would be in promoting better land use decisions by planning agencies in planning communities and by individuals in choosing to live closer to where you work.

Keep signs in public transportation stops and email the community.

Reduce automobile use and increase walking, bicycling and public transit options and really include this philosophy in planning and permitting all future developments.

Think we should also use some congestion pricing.

Absolutely! Incentives drive demand.

Carpool lanes on hwy26 would be helpful. Discounts on passes for monthly and yearly max riders.

Easy ways to find carpooling opportunities.

I am in support of all efforts to increase options for non-car folks to get to jobs at all hours and on weekends.

Incentive vs. value, other options that might be available i.e. don't offer car share incentives if the Max goes that exact same place.

Like I said....carpool lanes. Why are there so few in the metro area?

Metro should take an assertive standpoint in promoting active transportation for reasons related to public health.

Publish "favorite walking routes" in brochures, newspapers, YouTube, etc. Encourage citizens to submit their favorites.

Safety. Ability for people to get to their destinations quickly using alternative travel options.

Social norming - "lowering your carbon footprint is the right thing to do, whether or not there are regulations - and get your friends to do it too."

The costs and how well this system would work for a low income person. We must have safe roads with walkways to travel down to reach these options such as public transportation. If it isn't safe or well lit then it is wasted effort.

This is not likely to create huge improvements, but if people don't know about options they won't use them.

Very important. Should be a top priority.

Yes but not much. Some face to face and use volunteers but not big add campaigns.

Yes to all of the above!

Good to get the information out, but not the top priority. Limited interest from those invested in a single vehicle philosophy.
I have no idea, but less single occupant vehicles on the road would be greatly appreciated.

I'm not sure we need incentives. The cost savings of gas, insurance, etc. is incentive enough.

Metro should contact and visit other locations in the country that have been successful. Why reinvent the wheel and end up with something unworkable that the public ignores. Types of choices you mention are a problem for families with children. Day care requires that you be on time every day!

20 minute communities plan should be expanded upon and alternative transportation options between said communities.

Actively disincentivizing single occupancy motor vehicle commuting should be part of transportation policy.

Companies with lower wage earners should be given more incentives. Recreation centers should offer their customers incentives. Information should be easily search-able and verifiable and a safe option. And trips to and from work or school should of course be considered, but also trips to the grocery store or to other retail, restaurants, doctors offices, and every location can can improve one's quality of life.

Do it, but it's a low priority. Providing on the ground options is what really counts.

Do not put the cart before the horse when it comes to information and incentives. Take care of the basics first. The cleanliness and safety of the transit as well as not long waits between times of transit are key. Waiting 20 minutes for a connection option in a rainy area is a non-starter for most and when this is solved with more connections this needs to be known. Informing people how great the transit is and then offering transit one to three times per hour is simply lying to people.

I would like to see transit times printed on all transportation station shelters. I like the use of electronic signs to tell passengers when next their bus/streetcar/train is coming.

Keeping Portland on the forefront of mass transit.

Make it available for ALL people, esp those low income folks!

Maybe educate people with cars that they can do without them. I’ve been carfree for all of my adult life (45 years) and have not had any trouble with it.

Private auto rides should not be the first thought.

Really look at the costs to DO something as well as the costs to NOT DO something. Sometimes you subsidize one thing that ends up with additional (hidden) costs.

Reducing congestion, delay, pollution, and toxics.

Require new building to provide parking! Levy property tax separately on parking space that is dedicated to all forms of transit.

Social media and the internet are the primary ways I get information on different transportation options.

Solo drivers should be discouraged. Perhaps parts of downtown served well by transit should be off limits to cars.
Strongest incentive I can think of is tying the proposed roadway maintenance tax to how badly your chosen method of transport degrades the infrastructure. Freight and private motorists pay (substantially) more, cyclists and transit riders pay less. Or nothing. This isn't preferential - it's just fair - and could provide a serious incentive to get people out of their cars.

These investments must be approached very cautiously, very incrementally. Great risk of backlash. Give priority to M&R of the systems we have, over this expansion.

This will have only modest impact, so not a lot should be spent on it.

Affordability. Often incentives are given to people working in areas where they already make a living wage. People who work in non profit or service industry jobs often don't have access to incentives.

As long as the options aren't just more big highways, parking lots, and convenience for drivers of personal autos.

Businesses and organizations should fund incentives, not taxpayers.

But I doubt information is limiting here.

Communication is the key. Without communicating effectively, all the projects and programs you can come up with are next to useless. Information, incentives and good communication are extremely important.

Cost and equity. This is a lower priority unless it is actively engaging communities with lower incomes in the process of program development and implementation. Partner with existing community groups to identify and build out projects for increasing engagement. Evaluate existing tools and keep the ones that are producing results and cutting the ones that are not - avoid short cycle collateral and program re-designs: stick with the stuff that works and don't waste time on continual incremental improvements - those can be done an a longer cycle (e.g.: create collateral and tools that are designed to last at least 2-5 years).

Cost is the best incentive. Make driving expensive, other transportation cheap.

Dedicate traffic lanes and parking to auto sharing.

Demand based Tolls for driving with equity lens for low income people (should have said this earlier.all of these shiuld be incentivized.

Device a clear and efficient way to get people together in carpools. Also vet participants as much as possible to ensure safety.

Disincentives to businesses that operate in ways that make travel options difficult (e.g. some sort of tax or fee for businesses that support automobile use (e.g. free parking) over transit use (e.g. giving employees free bus passes).

Education and Encouragement are just as important as how we engineer our roads. I strongly support expanding the promotion of travel options, especially to new populations such as students.
Emphasize incentives, i.e. Convenient, free bicycle parking at large events to encourage people to bike rather than drive cars or trucks causing traffic jams. The Boston Red Socks does this to ease congestion on game days. Volunteer bike parking valets get free tickets to the game. win-win!

How to best reach people that strictly drive a personal vehicle, and how to convince them to give up the super convenience of a car for taking the bus, etc. I recently found SmartTrips and that is an AMAZING resource. Gettin' the word out, word.

How to reach the most people who aren't already doing this. Incentives.

I have not witnessed this to be very effective. It is so hard to find folks that work the same hours and close by.

I see this as a lower priority than infrastructure improvements. I would like support in this area to go to programs that show demonstrated results at increasing the number of people using different transportation options besides single occupancy vehicles.

I support more incentives but there's already plenty of info out there.

I think education is important, but how effective is another shiny brochure? This is not a rhetorical question. I really don't know the answer. People who carpool etc., should get to have stickers on their vehicles that say: "you're welcome" to the people who are not actively helping to cut down on emissions and use less energy. Can there be discounts or other financial or tax incentives for people who choose public transportation?

I think incentives will help people "get their feet wet" in choosing more responsible options, and small incentives can have big payoffs for reduced road maintenance.

I think there is quite a bit of this available already. I do not see the need to expend a lot of extra funds or time for this category.

I would like to see businesses incentivized to have more people work from home.

I would prefer more focus on walking, biking and public transit than vanpools or carpools. Car sharing--I'm not sure we need large investments in it.

I'd love to see a tax incentive or rebate to encourage biking and carpooling for commuting to work.

If it doesn't cost too much.

I'm sure some people won't consider alternative means of transportation because they simply don't know to think outside the box.

Incentives especially. people should be encouraged, and rewarded, for nature- and socially-positive choices.

Incentives should be provided to get the movement going. Employers should receive recognition for the percentage of their workforce that uses travel options. Employees should also be recognized in some way.

Incentivising this option, or deincentiveize single occupanc vehicle use.

Incentivize private employers to offset costs to employees.

Including all options.
Information is always good regarding all of those options. But if the bus system is not on time, it will not work. And if you see the weight issue in Multnomah County, you know that folks will not walk that much. You also have to take into effect the age of the average commuter and the seasons.

Information/advertising at DMV about carpooling options might be helpful for informing all drivers of their various transportation options. In Tualatin, I only know about the vanpool due to a co-worker riding it.

It would be great if businesses had more tax incentives to provide transit passes to workers at greatly reduced costs, and to promote biking by providing incentives (small increase in pay?) to their employees who walk or ride their bikes.

Low cost, low effectiveness. Minor part of the program.

Make sure the systems are easy to use and are updated frequently. The rideshare program I tried to use a couple years ago was terrible.

Make trip-planning by bike easy in the Portland Metro area. Provide info on very busy streets about safer alternate routes for biking. Make using alternate modes as easy as possible.

Many neighborhoods are trapped from these alternative transportation areas. I live on a major thoroughfare, cesar chavez, and I fear walking up and down the street due to high, speeding traffic with no crosswalks.

Most such "information providing" over the past three decades has been utterly ignored. Can I think it might get better? I think it will be of most benefit to a handful of ad agencies.

No one wants to carpool.

Not carpools, not vanpools. Carsharing I think is coming along nicely. More public transit. I don't think we need to provide incentives for people to do it, we just need to make it easy for them to do it.

Please consider creating partnerships with surrounding counties/cities so that people who live in the metro pdx area but not in pdx or multnomah also have good mass transit options.

Prioritize incentives for walking/biking/transit, fare abatement, and emphasize physical activity.

Public service messages do work and an informed population is likely to adopt and drive further emissions reduction actions in the future. No pun intended.

Right on target. Can you say carbon tax :-)

Sure, but voluntary/education actions such as this are unlikely to make much of a dent in our greenhouse gas emissions. Other steps - like improving bus service - are far more important.

Sure, why not. But the best ways to get people to bike and walk more is to make them feel safer doing it and make sure they can safely get to the places they want to go. More brochures won't help--we need more crosswalks, sidewalks, and protected bike lanes.

Targeting populations that would be able to benefit with the least amount of urging first, from there expand out to populations that may not realize that these forms of transportation are a viable solution.
Test carefully to see what works. Use best practices. Be frugal-minded! Perhaps the rewards can be social instead of financial. Perhaps single-occupancy drivers can fund the rewards system.

There should be a tax credit for those who take public transportation.

Think about how to communicate effectively with the largest number of people at the smallest possible cost.

Use local neighborhood newspapers to inform people of travel options use local art schools and art departments of grade and highschools to create art/billboards, etc. that encourage carpooling, ride sharing, etc.

VERY IMPORTANT.

We already do a better than average job of getting out the word on green travel options. Additional expenditure on this area should focus on incentives, and overall it should be less funded than the first four strategies that have been discussed in this survey, which are far more crucial to everyday habitability, safety and public expense.

We are probably not going to get a large percentage of new cyclists without protected bike lanes, no matter how much information, programming and other incentives we provide. That being said I do support programs that encourage alternative transportation, such as the Bike Commute Challenge.

We should devise ways to raise money from drivers to subsidize low income transit passes for the working poor.

Yes, but these programs need to get to the top. Is there information regarding how much CEOs, executives and people in top management positions use these programs? They should be marketed to as well. They should not simply be the beneficiary of having less traffic in which to drive their expensive cars to work because the rest of us are taking part in these other travel option programs.

Again not as high a priority.

Considering people who do not live/work in "popular" parts of town, but still need access. People who work in the suburbs but live in Portland. People who work unusual hours, like evenings and weekends.

Encourage more employers to offer transit pass options.

Ensure that implementation addresses the needs of non-English speaking communities, communities of color, and people impacted by poverty.

Geographic distribution of potential users. Income, ethnic and age of potential users.

I support incentives for biking, walking and public transit.

Individualized marketing needs to be expanded.

It's great to encourage people to use what we have, but ST johns really needs train service.

More bike support structures. Encourage businesses to have showers for bikers. Allow carsharing.

Need charging stations for electric cars.
Really a "maybe". Education with a goal of behavior change is seldom effective. Public awareness campaigns tend to preach to the converted. Need to go beyond the customary approach of "if only they know they'll change". Many good programs already exist within agencies and non-profit organizations. More about compliance/ adoption that awareness.

As long as no trees are harmed in the implementation of this, I'm in favor. Provided it doesn't cost too much so that the tax-payer isn't asked to spend more money on taxes, I'm in favor. But first try cheap or free advertising sources, please.

Quit pretending that downtown Portland is the only transportation hub which should be considered.

Even though managing supply (all the examples given are supply) is less effective than demand management.

A series of free apps to assist citizens to plan their trips in various transportation modes / kiosks or other information tools for planning trips and connect individuals with options.

Continue to fund TMAs and other similar programs.

Give priority to info and incentives for trips made on foot, bike and transit.

Group discounts on transit fare tickets for organizations (like the special rate for students and faculty of PSU).

The region is very dispersed as a result of single use zoning implemented everywhere for decades. A better idea would be to have bus service based on demand as identified with smart devices.

Use media - mass and social to spread information about transportation.

A big part of this should be disincentivizing single occupancy vehicles. A good way of doing this would be to raise Oregon's stagnant gas tax and to install diverters that make SOV trips difficult while allowing transit/bikes/people on foot to pass in the most direct manner.

A site to find others who want to share.

Addressing the issue of crime in order to make people feel safe will go a long way to promote non-automobile forms of travel.

All urban citizens should have neighborhoods with sidewalks.

Also provide disincentives, i.e. congestion pricing, tolls, etc.

Be cost efficient when designing a portfolio of encouragement programs. Walking, bicycling and transit encouragement programs yield far greater benefits on the basis of people converted to the target mode than do carpooling programs.

Better marking and enforcement of bike lanes, including requiring bikers to follow traffic rules as well as motorists. More downtown bicycle parking opportunities for commuters.

Bike-Sharing!

Compare costs to car ownership.

Education is great, but it will not get far without the infrastructure of bus lanes and protected bike lanes to offer a real alternative.
Education is huge. I would suggest investing in a community based social marketing expert.

Education is power. New residents coming from auto-dependent parts of the country need someone to teach them how to get around without a car.

HOV lanes, dedicated bike routes, requiring parking to be part of apt. developments to avoid forcing more vehicles into residential areas. Again, Clinton St congestion seems to be driven by the ridiculous explosion of apt.s on Division w/o parking. Quit kowtowing to developers.

I am not sure that this would help change mind of those who are anti-transit but is worth trying.

I think this area should also include the encouragement (through code) of building low or no-car housing projects.

Incentives to stay out of cars should be the norm. Apparently there's an elaborate system in parts of London to capture license plates to assess tolls. This is a perfect use of high-tech coupled with fairness and equity. INVEST IN PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE IN EVERY NEIGHBORHOOD, and NOT JUST IN THE PEARL, SW, or NW!!!

Just a small investment. Carsharing, carpools and vanpools could be left to the private sector.

Not as big a priority as other investments.

Reduced parking fees for car pool vehicles that carry four or more people. Increase the number of car pool parking places. Reduce Trimet fares. Increase Trimet employer taxes.

Study what they do in Cuba, as an add-on: make it legal for certain types of licensed vehicle drivers to pick up anybody waiting for a ride at specified intersections..... Also work with employers and schools to stagger schedules so not everybody is commuting at the same time.

The fights happening over UBER car sharing already. People like it, taxis don't. Loss of taxes from taxi companies.

The information is important; however, it is way more important to actually provide safe streets! I'm less interested in feeling good about the fact that I commute by bicycle than I am interested in there actually being a safe route for me to take.

Think it is more beneficial to encourage biking, walking, and public transit than it is for carsharing and carpools.

This education should also include materials for drivers on how to share the road properly with cyclists.

This is absolutely imperative for our future growth.

This is great, but the infrastructure and options have to be there first. Transit is way too slow and bike/ped infrastructure way too incomplete/uncomfortable to be good alternatives for many trips for many people in the area.

This is great, TDM is good, but don't use this as a substitute, not everyone can participate in these programs. Encourage Cities like Beaverton who do not believe in the benefits of TDM to change their ways.

Voluntary participation is key, with as little fees charged as possible.
What are legal barriers to sharing? Work to reduce or eliminate restrictions on sharing transportation or innovating new options.

Yes, but don't break the bank and leave some money for the actual improvement.

Yes, minimizing our dependence on private automobile usage.

Incentive employers to subsidize transit use to the same degree they subsidize auto use such as my company that gives free parking in downtown parking garages but does nothing for those of use that use transit (which is a majority of the employees).

I am a Car2Go member - primarily because I use that service when I travel to another city. It doesn't work well for me as a substitute for owning a vehicle because my office is in Tigard, and I have many meetings in Beaverton, close-in SW, Lake Oswego - and none of these areas are in Car2Go coverage areas. If Car2Go had a coverage area that also included all of SW Portland, Beaverton, Tigard, and Lake Oswego I would consider giving up my car and relying on Car2Go, public transit and walking and biking.

I'd like to see the expansion of private-sector services such as Car2Go and Bike Share services. If incentives could be provided to Car2Go to allow their coverage area to extend from just downtown and eastside to include Lake Oswego, Tigard, and Beaverton I would consider getting rid of my car and relying solely on Car2Go and public transit. As it is, I have too many meetings and public transit is too cumbersome and time consuming for me to use, so I drive my own car.

I'm all for providing travel options to get more cars off the road, but I don't believe in car pool lanes as they just seem to create more congestion by taking a lane for most users.

Incentives for walking, not riding either in cars or on bikes.

I've recently become a more frequent user of the streetcar system, and was impressed with the usefulness of the pdx streetcar app. Technology could help with expanding alternative travel options.

Just do it!

Limited. This should only augment existing programs. Not detract from actually providing service.

PSA's can help with this.

The working poor and people with disabilities. Ways to carry things on busses. It is very hard to get around with packages on Triment sometimes. Not everyone can ride a bike or walk and some people don't have time when trying to get from work to pick up their kids.

This can be a worthwhile investment.

This has worked well to reduce the # of cars on the road during commute hours for many cities.

This is a relatively inexpensive way to improve transit efficiency.

To connect with businesses to support this effort, like by providing adequate bike storage and on-site showers.
Additionally, there should be a disincentive for the use of private vehicles -- more paid on-street parking, congestion pricing, etc.

Any steps taken toward increasing ride-sharing, mass transit use, and active transportation are worth-while and in the long run cheaper than expanding and maintaining our current automobile infrastructure.

Coordinate information with the actual provision of travel options (bus service, bikeways etc.).

I support not only incentives for car alternatives, but disincentives for driving.

Information yes! Incentives NO...people will either do it or they won't. It is not taxpayers job to pay someone to carpool!

Perhaps our biggest employers - like Intel and OHSU - could offer their own transportation (similar to the "Google bus") alternative to individual cars.

Pre-tax transit passes are great. Providing a platform that makes it easy to find and vet carpool members is also a big help, and piggybacks on things that companies here in Portland, like AirBnB, already have.

Providing information has not been very effective in the past. This policy should include removing incentives for single rider automobile use, such as tax breaks for parking, and should instead substitute employer paid transit passes for free parking.

Providing this cheaply and measuring the effectiveness.

Start with children in school. Get them away from their parents' cars.

This information has to reflect real, tangible changes to the transportation system that will attract the average car-driving citizen.

Use a strategy of communication that focuses on advancing change at a pace that our society can adjust to. My dream is that we have far fewer cars. But if we promote change that is too aggressive, we won't affect change well. It will take time.

A monthly transit pass that is actually a discount over paying per ride would be a huge benefit. How about discounted passes for registered college and community college students?

Absolutely!

Accessibility to disabled people.

But is it necessary for local governments to invest a great deal of money to "provide information" re: travel options?

Discouraging car ownership is critical to out success. Gas tax and license fees should be used to subsidize transit and car share.

Encourage employers and school to supplement the cost of getting bus passes, etc.
ENCOURAGEMENT. You don't even mention it as an option. Much of the urban metro area already has some sort of bike network but too many people do not understand or feel comfortable trying it out. We do nothing to encourage high school students to ride. THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX. What does science tell us about why people do not choose to ride... FIX that. Bring professional sociologists and psychologists into the equation. Fund studies. Do more than just "build it". Fighting a carbon intensive lifestyle will take more than engineers. We must look at the people side of the equation. Change is difficult, even if there is a nice new shiny ap or bike network. Make driving difficult and make active transportation attractive. Increase gas and parking prices and make alternatives easy, affordable and socially expected.

Enticement, rather than pedantry.

For some it might help to emphasize doing one's part in fighting global warming, air pollution and such. Emphasizing cost saving (with motorized vehicles--gas, insurance, parking etc.) and health benefits (with bikes and walking) might make folks more likely to use travel options.

Here's my take on this: If you want to get people out of their cars, all the information in the world won't help. We have to provide MUCH more frequent, convenient, and inexpensive mass transit--that's the only way. Incentives are fine, but they're no substitute for actually providing an alternative that gets people to work/school/home in almost the same amount of time as their cars. We have to focus on transit speed, and I think that express buses and tunneling MAX under downtown Portland have to be done.

I don't think this needs to be a huge priority. The existing levels of publicizing of other travel options is sufficient.

I have family members who should not have to drive as much as they do but they aren't aware of all the options listed here. When they think of "not driving as much" they think that means riding the bus everywhere. Carsharing & vanpooling would be great alternatives for them if they knew how it worked.

I have no idea. i actually almost checked no because it sounds impossible: people are either into it or they're not. but they had to get there someway so i suppose some form of education is needed.... certainly public biking safety classes for kids & adults sounds helpful, maybe information on how to use or combine the usage of public transit... i don't know, it sounds like a tough sell since everyone wants the freedom to go where they want, when they want!

I love using Car2Go, and would explore additional options, as well.

I think many people in our community are unaware of the travel options available to them. Information campaigns would be great, as would more companies providing transit passes. Employers should also be encouraged to compensate or give incentives to people who bike, walk, or carpool to work - their health care costs will be less, and their impact on the environment as well.
I think transportation to elementary schools should be considered, so that families have other options for getting kids to school without always having to drive or use buses. Have bike and walking school buses be an option with routes well thought out based on where children are actually coming from. Have the school itself become engaged in wanting to and actively urging and encouraging families to use active transportation. My son's school makes no effort to encourage this. Even having covered bike parking would be helpful.

Incentives but most importantly, location and convenience of transit.
Incentivize those who live/work in close proximity.
Increase the state gas tax and make it a percent of retail gas price.
Information is useless without improved infrastructure. When are we adding lanes to the Vista Ridge Tunnel?
Like all of these options. More carsharing type options like zipcar and car2go! Bike lanes are great, more more! But keeping bikers in those lanes are as important. So dangerous when the biker jumps from the bike lane to the sidewalk to ride through the crosswalk, instead of stopping at the light.
Limit growth and encourage carpooling, mass transit, etc.
Mass transit, alternative modes like Uber & bike/ride share.
Monitored bike transportation centers where riders can shower and change before and after work.
Not only incentivize the options like walking, transit, biking, skateboarding; but DISINCENTIVIZE private car usage. Or at a minimum, tax private car users for the toll they take on our urban communities. Many of the private car drivers are coming in from outlying suburbs, create mechanisms to recover cost from these users. I drive a big truck for work and own the business. Our business would be happy to pay more for the impact our private vehicle makes on our community.
On line citywide ride share boards, commuter matching services.
Paper materials aren't enough - work with schools, colleges, workplaces to support folks who want to walk or cycle or carpool. Coordinate bus schedules with major class/work schedules.
Parking free for car/van pools.
Parking incentives for carpool and vanpool go a long way.
People will continue to drive their own cars unless driving is penalized (too expensive) and transit is accessible or they have incentives to use transit or walk/bike.
Prioritize Safety first, then pedestrians, then bikes, then transit, then car sharing, then private automobiles.
Publicly shame big employers like Intel Corporation that do a very poor job of encouraging their employees to use alternative transportation.
Smart marketing should be used to "sell" the concept. We know it's needed, but we have to convince others.
The amount of money dedicated to this shouldn't be too great, but I think it is a productive idea.
The best to make this happen is to make it less convenient and more expensive to drive a car.

This should be priority #1. Smart Trips program is great - expand it, or create new ones that build on the lessons they've learned.

Traffic would be helped by staggered start and stop times at businesses and some judicious placement of traffic police. I have witnessed again and again, traffic 'stuck' because someone pulled forward and the light changed so they're blocking traffic. Rush hour traffic doesn't function well on the honor system - people behave badly!

Uber maybe? Anything to increase carpooling/sharing would be huge.

Work with schools and employers to provide incentives.

Yes but at some point single occupancy vehicles must be de-incentivized.

Yes, but in keeping with the use of new technologies, let's focus on electronic communications, rather than mailers. Workplace incentives are also excellent. I can get a discount for taking the bus through my employer. Shouldn't I also get some reward for riding my bike?

Yes, but only in conjunction with making transit, biking and walking safe, easy and affordable.

A lot of people are moving to Portland. A lot of them bring their cars, and don't know what the other transportation options are. Is there a way to target and educate them?

Allow and encourage new ways to get around up to and including different ways to ride share.

At present these options aren't well-communicated. Businesses should do more to expand carpooling to their sites.

BTA, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, does a fabulous job of informing their members, past & present, of opportunities, concerns and ways to help. If other "Public awareness, education and travel options support tools" used their practices, word could be rapidly spread about non-polluting commuter options.

But affordability needs to be a central part of the equation as well as communication/technology that allows for convenient access.

Centralized ride share program with information on routes and transit planning would be beneficial.

Do more to encourage private service outlets to offer transit tickets as well as parking validations. E.g. physician & dental offices.

Do NOT just send out cheery messages/flyers/etc about these things - intelligent and useful as such things seem, they've not done nearly enough to make for action and changes of mind/style ..... "incentives" is an interesting concept here - wonder how that'd work?

Do what is cost effective.

Encourage TriMet to bring back bus lines and frequency that seems to have been lost in the move to provide more rail options.
Higher prices of gas through taxation if necessary to encourage ride sharing. Support development of apps for ride sharing. Work out safety/security issues.

I am not sure.

I support investment through communication and increasing public awareness. It shouldn't be a financial priority. If it works, people will use it.

If we are encouraging people to use alternate transportation, please educate them on bike rules, etc. Bicyclists want to be treated like a car when they are on the road then they need to act like a car while on "said" road.

Incentives are a drop in the bucket. We have to invest in alternative infrastructure. Until it makes more sense to leave the car at home, people won't (especially the newcomers who hate rain and brought their cars with them)(nothing against newcomers in general, just the ones that complain about rain and Oregon drivers/bikers/walkers - there are lots of other places without those things).

Incentives should focus on active transportation: transit, cycling, walking. Carsharing and carpooling are good short-term fixes, but we need to get more people using active transportation to make a serious dent in reducing our climate impact in order to reach our climate goals.

Lower priority. Young people will find the attractive alternatives. Monitor the 20s & 30s to see what works.

Make public transportation affordable or even free, it is way too high priced to ride the bus and MAX, especially for the working poor and students. Make drivers pay for how much they use their car. Restore the free zone downtown. Make walking, biking (although a lot of money has gone into improving that method of transportation already, and many people cannot get places on a bicycle because they are incapable of it or have to go a long way and don't have the time to spare) and WHEELCHAIR USE safer and more convenient.

Many of our highway entrances already have 2 lanes for cars to alternate with. these would be great places for queue-jumpers for carpools and buses to save a bunch of time and improve the incentive to rideshare.

More efficient and cost effective.

More private employers should offer incentives for their employees to use alternative forms of commuting beyond the individual automobile.

Not everybody can walk or bike. There need to be other options. A lot of car sharing can be implemented over the internet, and shouldn't require government funding. And if somebody wants to act like a taxi, they should have to pay taxes just as taxis do.

NYC has an app that provides alternatives to taxis and buses. Should consider this for PDX.

People using active transportation make certain sacrifices to better their community and should be rewarded.

Social media is a great way to encourage involvement through friendly competition.

Some sort of clearinghouse for carpools and car-sharing would be great.

Sure, let's promote this stuff - but please make sure we have good infrastructure in place, too.
The new tax benefit for parking should be offset by incentives for biking, transit, pooling, and walking.
The sole priority here should be to make driving unattractive while making more environmentally sound methods of transport more attractive.
There is no silver bullet. It will take many options that all add up to better transit.
This category has the potential for BIG return on investment in terms of utilization of existing and scheduled capacity. Increase use of interactive media outreach and tools.
This entirely depends on how well the incentives perform. Keep very good track of returns on investment. Might be counter-intuitive what actually works to change behavior.
This will result in a lower climate impact while enhancing community and social connections, equity, and health.
To be effective, information must be delivered continuously in multiple formats. Use the tech industry in Portland to develop phone/tablet apps that will help in all of these areas (including questions 1-4 that is).
Transit options to Salem are ridiculously sparse.
Unceasingly educate the public at large about the stark reality of the near- and long-term future of transportation planning, and what strategies are necessary and unavoidable. Unceasingly educate the public at large about the need to provide for the needs of a constantly growing regional population while decreasing traffic injuries and deaths and improving public health by returning to non-sedentary lifestyles by more widely adopting active transportation. #1 cause of death among children and adolescents in the USA: automobile crashes. #1 cause of death among adults in the USA, diseases stemming from inactive/sedentary lifestyles, a problem that only emerged with the age of the auto-oriented lifestyle.
Working with employers to support alternative transportation to and from work.
Yes, but, millions of dollars have been poured into these campaigns. What have been the results thus far? Have the campaigns been successful? Before spending more money on information campaigns and incentives, please study what has been done before and weigh what works and what doesn't.
Yes, yes, yes, yes. This should be the number one priority.
Depends on the programs. Some are effective, some a waste of time, effort and money.
Fiscal incentives for carpooling, and potentially regulatory requirements that a certain percentage of employees carpool in congestion management areas (e.g. Downtown Portland, Airport Way, etc.) Explore ways that smartphone technologies can facilitate carpools, including participant ratings and cost-sharing payments (but no uber taxis, please).
I support outreach for supporting marginalized communities and outer communities. I don't think that more options education in inner SE Portland, however, would be as high a priority as encouraging more affordable housing. Income is a top predictor of car ownership.
I think this should be a lower funding priority than bike/ped and transit projects, but included.
Information and incentives should reach a wide swath of people including vulnerable populations.

Lower overall taxes.

More dedicated, protected bike lanes and bike parking.

More places to park your bike in shelter so it doesn't get all wet. The bikes on the max are great but not really available in the prime commute time - people are uptight about it. Bike racks on buses - great idea. Some how getting a bonus - more time off, or some other incentive for those who use public transportation or bike or walk.

Mostly give (additional) incentives to employers who can document a high percentage of employees who use public transportation or avoid or reduce single use of personal vehicles.

Newsletters about transit opportunities and how they can improve neighborhoods and communities.

Offer incentives only where public transit is unavailable.

People who use their cars do so for convenience and flexibility, so not likely to do carpools since that locks them into structure of timing and routes. Carpools happen when transit (which is just a giant carpool) is not an option. Get transit so it is perceived as giving the convenience and flexibility that having your car nearby gives you. The bus should always be nearby, come soon (without having to check a schedule) and go "most places."

Performance measures should be required so that only the most effective ways are used again.

Positive feedback for low VMT, negative feedback for high VMT.

Public input.

Put some of the cost back on employers especially those getting tax breaks already.

Rationale persuasion. Our government's sometimes tend to try to force things on people, which is detrimental to the larger goals.

See my note about city managed/maintained bikes earlier in this survey.

Start with major employers and ask how their employees get their. Expand the employer tax credits. Give a coupon on the back of bus passes. It has been done in San Diego.

The actual viability of the options. Trying to get people to use options that are not easily accessible or safe from their neighborhood. I counter productive. Find out what people in various low use areas of town need/want in order to make more use of the options and then do those things.

Although, as always, I see a lot of wasted money in this, like all the stupid Transportation Dept. mailers I get that tell me it's healthy to walk, and other inanities. Waste of money!

Any approach in this direction needs to go further and work to actively remove existing incentives to drive alone. Trying to win with transit, active transportation, and smart lifestyle choices is nearly impossible when the alternative (driving alone) has been re-making the rules for decades.
But this is a lower priority because I don't expect it to have much impact. I believe that people will choose convenience over car-pooling and ride-sharing.

Carpool Information probably doesn't do anyone any good - but information about travel behavior in the aggregate could make people think more clearly about transportation. Billboards explaining how many more parking spaces would be needed downtown without transit, bike, and ped commuters.

Commit to a regular, ongoing communication plan. Billboards, signs, radio and TV commercials.

Difficulty of getting people out of their cars, need some really good incentives.

Direct more support and information about car sharing to low income areas.

Don't do what California is doing around ride share.

Encouraging less polluting activities.

I think Portland's travel option program focusing on different parts of the city has been effective. Please consider impact on on-street parking by designated carshare/pool spaces. Have the latter but not to the exclusion of non sharing spaces.

Information is not as important as more and safer paths.

Information yes, not so sure about incentives.

It needs to be easy to do. No stupid government websites that hardly work. A unified login and one site would be amazing. It needs a flashy app that works well and is simple. Unfortunately, that's just the world we live in.

It won't make much difference if there isn't any real reliable improvements to the new options. just make sure what is done is effective.

No new taxes or fees for consumers or businesses.

Not sure.

People need encouragement to do the right thing.

Personalized marketing works. It can seem expensive but it pays off. huge companies like Facebook know this. people listen to people. invest in personalized marketing.

Provide a dozen free bus passes to employers of 50 or more people.

Remembering to maintain public transit within the inner city of Portland before expanding father outside to the suburbs of Portland.

Set up tables at grocery stores and big boxes such as Costco, Wal-Mart.

Some spending on education/outreach seems reasonable.

Sounds positive, but once again, the real solution is a strong public transit system and a city that encourages biking and walking.
Sure, but how much good does this really do? I'd want to see a study first showing that spending money this way actually makes a difference.

Tax incentives for people who use bikes.

The two things I think that would be necessary for carpooling to increase dramatically, is a public internet site for matching up potential carpool partners and television advertising to promote carpooling and the website. For public safety people who sign up for carpooling site would need to be vetted, no sex offenders, felons or drug addicts.

This has really great potential allow Hulu to be used in the Portland region.

This is a great low-cost way to improve use of our system.

This is important but won't substitute for ensuring the safety of bike/walk commuters.

Use of the Internet for communicating should be supplemented by regular mail for the benefit of those who do not have Internet access. It should be noted that not everybody can get to a library to make use of public Internet access!

While it can take more time and effort, I feel personal, one-on-one outreach is very effective when encouraging new travel options.

Carsharing sounds an awful like Uber, and that would a NO. We don't need anymore "businesses" cutting into our minimum wage utopia. Vanpools are too slow, walking is great, and biking we covered in earlier questions, which leaves mass transit. And I say sure, but where will it go? The NIMBY mentality keeps mass transit from going anywhere near where people could actually use it. Every day on 205 I see the few people walking out across the bridge to get to the MAX there in the middle of the freeway. Sure glad I'm not disabled and/or really poor (I'm a teacher). What about low impact streetcars? What about a MAX line up Burnside right through the heart of Laurelhurst? You do that, and I'm on board.

Consider free transit passes for all. Stop ticketing kids who ride the MAX.

Convenience re including children in all the alternative methods of transportation.

Direct vanpools from downtown to major companies on the west side like Intel and Nike. With bike parking downtown, would increase alternative car usage.

Giving public and private employers a subsidy so their employees can use alternative travel options to/from work. I would buy a discounted monthly pass from my employer Portland Community College if they allowed all employees to receive a discounted Tri-met pass to use the Max or Bus to get to and from work, rather than driving. Currently they only provide this to employees who work at the Downtown Center not on each of their campuses.

Helping people understand the options is useful but good design should make the system easy to access, understand and use.
I do, but I think that networking with the business community is essential. There needs to be a program for employers to easily incentivize their work force to use reliable alternative modes & means of getting to and from work. But we need 24 hour transit to be part of that conversation. I think Govt can provide the education/networking and help business to see why it's important that they participate.

I support more direct incentives such as property tax rebates or some valuable incentive to coax people out of their cars and off their couch.

I think people do this informally, so it isn't so necessary (relatively speaking) to spend $$ on this.

Identify pockets where there are patterns of travel behavior that conflict with regional goals. Improve services and target populations that live there.

If possible, public transportation fare for regular people should be lowered.

If we are to avoid paving everything, we have to use the existing road system more efficiently and provide more realistic and safe alternatives to the car.

Information is key, incentives don't seem sufficient to influence ongoing travel choices.

Information yes, propaganda, no.

Look at international examples of regulated ad hoc private jitney services. With everyone carrying smartphones that give pinpoint location accuracy this is attainable.

Minimal costs.

More incentives is great. If people don't know by now about carpools/walking/biking/transit, they live under a rock and there will be nothing to help them. The rest of us are ready for incentives.

Only use incentives in order to promote market transformation. Be careful not to use incentives where they aren't needed. Information is great.

Providing incentives for folks to walk and bike and base car registration fees and insurance on the mileage a car uses.

Public work places should provide incentives to cyclists and pedestrians in the same way they currently reward to carpool and public transport users.

Similar to "Healthy Choices" type programs that result in reduction of medical premiums and co-pays, a program that encourages carpooling and transit use by offering a reduction in DMV license renewal fees (vehicle or driver's license) might be effective.

The best incentive as proved many times over, again in Northern Europe is to provide the infrastructure needed to get people out of their, cars. No amount of spin will make a person get onto a bike if they don't feel safe or if routes are obscure and indirect. Make rial bike and ped use fast safe and easy. Make car use whht it should be in cities, slow, expensive and inconvenient. Sorry, this is the only real way to get change - again not a theory; just look at where it has worked.
There should be a website similar to Trimet.org that presents all options in getting from A to B; pedestrian routes (when feasible), bike routes, bus/max info, perhaps even carshare locations. Then, folks would be made aware of all travel options with each query. Carpooling is dead. Americans hate the inconvenience of having to accommodate anyone else’s plans, they enjoy the time alone in their cars and often want to run errands on the way to/from work.

These are investments with good ROI, as long as we make the infrastructure and service investments that make transportation options a rational choice for people.

These options need to be actively encouraged. Car pool services like drive less connect are functional but just barely. If the state wants people to carpool more better websites along with mobile versions need to be created. Also services like Uber and Lyft should be actively encouraged. Car share services need to get special credits and tax breaks to account for the savings on public parking facilities and general congestion. Owning a personal car needs to be more expensive.

Think about how to move jobs closer to neighborhoods so people don't have to automatically drive to work. Expand telecommuting or create neighborhood job hubs. Let us manage robot stand-ins at work so we don't actually have to be physically in meetings.

This seems like an area where a small increase in spending could lead to significant gains, and where it wouldn't take much of an increase to see significant improvements.

This should be heavily weighted in the direction of public transit, especially means of subsidizing fares for poorer people.

We have to do this, it's so late already to be making these changes.

What if you built a streetcar and nobody knew about it? That is what happened on the eastside loop. With some robust promotions, the cars have ridership. Let's not make the investment in our infrastructure if we aren't going to aggressively market it. We need to get the most out of our system.

Yes, but ..... information maybe, but not a bunch of big, splashy (expensive) PR campaigns. Not sure about incentives.

How do we ensure lower income individual shave incentives and that they don't just go to people who already have the most resources?

Incentives are helpful, but I think providing the physical infrastructure is more important. People will use what is convenient.

Not sure what incentives could be provided other than reduced fares, parking fees, etc. Money for advertising should be kept to a minimum as that budget can go nowhere fast.

Only if you make public transit more frequent and accessible, otherwise this won't work. If I have to wait for two trains to pass before loading my bike to go across town, I won't do it.
People who choose not to drive should receive a tax incentive and/or employer incentives. That includes public employees.

This is something that I think we pay for through TriMet - they should lead this up and Metro can broker the partnerships with the Zip Car and Car to Go and other private companies that stand to gain from increased collaborations...apps, street side systems.

A combination of Bus, Max, Car2Go and other options can make it much easier to get around.

Bicycle lights should be distributed free, to increase visibility and safety!

Bike share would be great!

Can we provide really serious incentives? A water bottle or t-shirt really doesn't cut it.

Cheaper public transit.

Congestion taxes/fines would be amazing at reducing traffic at peak hours and incentivizing people to find other forms of transportation. As it is, it costs me $5 for a trimet day pass, or ~$10 to park downtown - this isn't enough of a cost incentive. I choose not to drive for other reasons than cost.

Create community groups to organize.

Develop more incentives, advertising campaigns, rewards to bring new people into the fold. More free days, or perhaps a sweepstakes for a lucky new rider of mass transit.

Education and safety.

Education. I'm embarrassed that bicycle commuting did not occur as an alternative to me until 2005. A coworker parked her bike after her commute in a pouring rain and I realized I had to have it. Anything new takes adjustment, but I believe many don't even realize the alternatives that are available.

Encourage businesses to subsidize or offer transit passes and bike amenities, make transit reliable, frequent and accessible, expand lines and routes, push for quality separated bike infrastructure, create bike highways!

Encourage private businesses to provide shuttle service for employees, encourage businesses not to provide free parking for employees and to reward using alternative modes.

Glad city and other groups offer trimet passes or pay you to bike.

Help people understand how positively it can affect our environment and standard of living. I think bribing people to do it can only work in the short-term, but helping people realize actual positive impact on their lives can help make it a long-term habit.

I think quite a bit has been done locally on this. At a federal level, there needs to be tax deduction/credit parity with what is done for parking.

Incentives for this: not DISINCENTIVES not to do it.

It really is easy to not own a car here, all the car drivers must not realize it yet.
More support for TMAs and other community organizations to do great work with businesses and other community members to promote walking and biking and transit. Broader efforts should promote transit, walking, and biking. Carshare/vanpool efforts should be more targeted, working directly with large employers as opposed to trying to drive region-wide pooling system.

People should know the benefits to transit and bike commuting.

Please prioritize active and public transportation over your three forms or ride sharing ("carsharing, carpooling, and vanpooling" are all the same thing. Please just use one of the terms, this does not make a significant enough impact to warrant triple the attention).

Right now many of these options are harder to do than driving a car by yourself, we need to reverse that.

Tax breaks or incentives for businesses, institutions, and schools that reward people for biking or walking.

The info is out there and available so that brings us to "incentives". What incentives are you talking about?

Vanpools and Carsharing is great. Please consider the limitations of parking already in place before adding more of these signs and spots for vanpools and carsharing.

Walking school buses, biking to school. Get kids moving.

We should increase the gas tax. It is good for the earth and will make some money now, instead of arguing about how to make more money later. Coupled with coat savings from having fewer car streets, this method can meet our needs.

We should NOT consider the current taxi services in this city as competition or even a similar service to carsharing carpool services.

What gets people to carpool or chose to not use a car all by themselves.

What number do we have to reach to achieve the potential benefits listed above?

What will get people out of their cars and into alternative forms of transportation.

Yes pay me to ride my bike.

Yes, education. Not wonky government web sites, though. Hire someone (an outside firm) to make a really great consumer-friendly web sites, apps, maps, etc.

Yes, incentives work great. Support for social supports.

Easier access to mass transit, frequency, reliable times, ease of access at transit stations (better design - the stations at Hollywood and 60th are horrible with the long steps and creepy elevators).

I dont think the printed literature has the impact that it is intended for simply because I ha a hard time accessing such things and have found they are not in accessible locations.

I would like to propose isolation lanes on interstates for motorcycles. The smaller bikes get upwards to 85 MPG and would improve both air quality, and would require far fewer square feet of parking for many more vehicles.
Information is key, especially when it’s matched with new and improved services. For example, our bus system needs to be significantly improved in terms of its frequency and reliability. Once that's accomplished, get the word out!

Safety of riders. Provide free parking at centralized "meet-up" spots. Free lattes for riders? :)

Americans will not ride-share or carpool in great numbers. But tremendous investment in public transport is needed.

Carefully identifying and working with people most likely to convert to alternative modes. Concentrate funding on the programs that show results. Continue/expand discounts to local union members. Discounts for using public transportation to events, volunteering and work. Education about the benefits of alternative transportation options should be incorporated into the curriculum at all public schools.

Enable disruptive approaches like Uber and free-form ride share. No more protections/subsidies for taxi fiefdoms or top-down imposed solutions like TriMet. Encourage living close to work. Staggered work days. Encourage reduced car use. Especially biking. Focus on the incentive side. The reality is people tend to not want to take alternatives if there is a net-negative amount of time to get to/from work. That means infrastructure improvements in transportation may be more important than incentives.

High employment areas, making mass transit easy to use. I clicked yes on this because it's not expensive and might make a difference. Especially things like bikePortland maps, etc.

I say 'yes' with some hesitancy. Dollars for these investments mostly go to urban areas with good transit and TDM programs and not to areas such as suburban areas. In the suburban areas we need assistance to do this but really don't know where to begin with such a daunting project. I would prefer that fewer dollars be used in this category as it's inherently inequitable in terms of dollars spent regionwide. But, I would support working with Metro to create a TDM and/or incentive program that is effective in the suburban setting.

I shared the idea of promoting carpools and ride sharing earlier. Make more car pool lanes on highways. I think bicycles need to pay their share of infrastructure costs, like the bike lanes. License them and enforce it. Carsharing,etc are all good and to be encouraged.

Incentives have to be meaningful to those you target - find out from the target group what they (we) want/value.
Information and incentives can be very effective in supporting a culture that embraces travel options. It takes continuous support and broad campaigns can be very effective. The recent Metro campaign of Choose What Moves You is a wonderful example of inspiring people to consider using something other than a car. The campaign is fresh, resonating and not pedantic.

Involving the public and transit advocates in the discussion and coming up with viable solutions.

Lots of internet and computer support.

Make rideshare meetup points "rain friendly." Provide plenty of parking. Situate them at optimal sites. Consider tolls into downtown routes during commute hours and utilize electronic monitors to avoid time-consuming toll gates. Run small buses from rideshare points to light rail and bus terminals. Provide rideshare lanes/times throughout the freeway system and on major thoroughfares.

More park & ride parking on impermeable asphalt. If you made stacked parking, we wouldn't need so much space taken.

More ride-sharing!

More van pool or other shared transportation up and down the I-5 corridor. Why not have high speed train to and from Salem/Eugene?

Not sure how to make this happen. Again, not as high a priority but if you go to the trouble of creating a better transportation system you should advertise it a little.

Only for education on options. I already carpool and did not need a subsidy or incentive to do so. It's just the right thing to do.

People are selfish and lazy and they want to be in their own little cocoons.

People are selfish, want to get there first, easily.

Prioritize where it can be most effective and prioritize cost-effective approaches.

Provide great incentives for employers, as well as employees, to give individuals and entire organizations the opportunity to sign on.

Provide statistics on automobile deaths and injuries--in the tens of thousands every year nationally, and I don't understand why we accept this--as well as on the benefits of walking, biking, or busing.

Providing incentives is almost always tricky. How to get the word out most effectively is often a trial-and-error process.

Safety. As I understand it that is what the city is worried about concerning "Uber", however there is also the underlying economic reason about depriving the cab companies of their share of the pie. There is also an undercurrent about bicycles and whose using them. Remember, Portland is made up of lots of people of all ages, many of whom do not use bicycles, but who do pay taxes.

Sure, but don't count on a lot of payoff from this.
Tax breaks to people who drive less -- biking, busing, walking, working from home all reduce the issues here. make more transit/bike dedicated roads. incentivize alternate ways to commute by making it harder to drive.

Tax breaks/added incentives for monthly mass transit passes would be a smart approach.

The LESS people DRIVE, the better it makes cities in EVERY possible way!! Again, visit ANY city in Europe.

This helps but is lower priority than safety for vulnerable road users.

This is helpful and effective, but people really need to be educated that every action they take makes a difference and is vitally important.

This is important for access to weekly community activities, such as Farmer Markets, and school sporting events to help minimize traffic and parking concerns along our already crowded streets.

Time required to use alternate forms of transportation, employer time incentives.

Walking and biking should be the primary areas of emphasis.

What are the obstacles to using current alternatives? a.) I can't avoid driving in rush hour because childcare arrangements make my daily routine inflexible. b.) I can't ride my bike because there is no safe, direct route between home and work. c.) I can't take public transportation because it's too slow to be practical. Remove either b. or c. obstacles and I would be more than happy to abandon my car.

Work backwards from the workplace and commercial centers to coordinate similar destination transportation.

YES, this would go a long way toward changing the commuting mindset - certainly has at OHSU.

As targeted by empirical data; people more likely to use their own motor vehicle are not likely to use mass transit based upon their reason for choosing the motor vehicle in the first place.

But don't people already know they can walk, ride a bike or take the bus and train instead of drive?

Cost and taxation issues, however I do support public education and incentives to reduce greenhouse gases, but again I personally cannot afford to pay for this education.

Demographics - analyze frequency of use.

Don't make the perfect the enemy of the good - car sharing is not a substitute for public transit.

Many of us still commute long distances where biking, or transit does not work. There will always be a need that cannot be met for everyone, but options will help. Safer communities would encourage us to walk or bike more. I walked over to my 7-11 and was screamed at by a truck load of men driving by. Even in Gateway we get panhandled by the homeless or mentally ill. Last time I rode my bike I was harassed by a driver on NE 148th. I like the idea of Uber.

People need to know that there are options so it needs to be publicised.

Public transport, especially.

Special discounts for people/families below 40 or 50 percent median income.

To not take away from car traffic. there are times that people are not able to carpool or use transit however when the focus goes there then people want to take away from car drivers which only makes things worse.
Unfortunately, I think the bulk of people are not going to read the stuff put out or watch it on TV or anything else. Most people, run errands on the way home, which requires I don't have to haul people around with me to do those things or go home first to get my car to back track and do those errands, pick up kids at school, etc... I just don't think the bulk of people are going to do this stuff. It's not convenient.

Yes, financial incentives are always popular. Transportation is expensive and many families would be motivated to shave some money off this part of their budget.

Again, good use of money to wring more mobility out of current infrastructure.

Education most important and options. Passes such as they do on Hwy 101 in Bay area for carpool lanes are efficient and means of revenue and less strain on police patrol or keeping the car pool lanes as current. Unfortunately, there are professions where one must use a car and it may also double as an extension of their office. They can not ride the Max or bike if they wanted to. Their needs must also be considered too.

Eliminate barriers that are keeping this from happening NOW.

Emphasize "cost-effective"

First, your "more information" buttons are useless! When I ask for more information, I want to know what you are proposing, not pie in the sky ideals that were written by a salesman. I'm beginning to believe this "survey" is just an attempt to get buy-in for you to spend money, not in any way an honest attempt to ask for citizen input. Despite that, I'll add my opinion. Ride share should be available on the web abnd as an app for a smart phone that clearly defines the prospective drivers driving record, insurance and safety rating. Drivers should be required to take a FREE safety class that verifies credentials before they are allowed to ask for riders. Any 4 person or more vehicle should receive dedicated parking at a reduced monthly rate. TriMet needs to make their signboards accurate and needs to post clearly stated delays when buses are stuck in traffic.

Prior comments cover this.

Stop making driving irresistible. Any plan you read supports less driving and more walking, bicycling and transit use. However, the actions of ODOT, Metro, and most local governments focus first and foremost on making driving safe and convenience with the "options" as an afterthought.

While there should be more incentives, it is likely that investing in infrastructure will be more productive. People need safe ways to walk, bike or take transit. If they don't feel safe, incentives won't be persuasive.

"Local, regional and state agencies work together with businesses and non-profit organizations to implement programs that provide information about travel choices, maintaining vehicles to operate more efficiently, and adopting driving habits that help save time and money and reduce emissions." How about embracing telecommuting? This would reduce all of the above concerns.

Comparisons between transit and private vehicle travel times including time spent finding and using parking at destinations.
Equity among all communities.

Great! Perhaps give companies some tax incentive or individuals?

Match types of incentives to target demographics.

This also is an essential. The more information in the most formats is essential to demonstrate the personal, economic and environmental benefits to reducing our dependence on fossil fuels for transportation.

Uber.

Very important program, high priority, fully fund this immediately and continuously.

With caveats. People still drive and always will, regardless of what TED Talks say. Make options viable for all times of day - not just 9 - 5 commuters.

Comprehensive on line schedule of all potential methods of travel.

Educate motorists how to safely drive around cyclists and pedestrians, especially in high traffic areas and areas with non-continuous sidewalks. Educate the public about how to be safe using their bicycle and the benefit of lights whether on foot and on a bicycle. Talk to employers about giving employees an incentive for carpooling, such as help with gasoline, a small bonus, or a free gift on the company (i.e. gift cards).

Effective use of social media and websites to disseminate info.

How to get private companies to fill transit gaps. How to increase interest and penetration of private industry in transit (e.g., van pools, carpools, express buses) and minimize government involvement.

I think governments do a good job of advertising those options already. Besides, most people I know make their transit decisions for reasons other than a PSA.

More support for car sharing like Zipcars.

Need to adjust attitudes of both drivers and cyclists to better encourage sharing the road.

RESTORE FREE SERVICE ZONES! Give kids in school free transit!

Suburban employers especially need to implement this policy as they have less access to transit and more congestion on their limited access highway systems. If we do this, we need to have more investment in parking garages and Park and Ride lots near commuter rail and Tri-Met bus stations to make it more convenient.

The biggest incentive to leave the car at home is to make the active trans. system easier, cheaper, more frequent and safer.

The roads have reached beyond critical mass.

The waistlines of Americans are on average larger than ever before. If more folks bicycled or walked to work, the average waistline would begin shrinking. Encourage folks to use active transportation for their health, which will lower health care costs and overall transportation costs and maintenance.

This is all good stuff. Keep in mind that not everyone has a regular route that is easily scheduled and matched.
Use positive reinforcements, NOT negative ones. Use programs that cost little and make common sense.

What information would be most useful to the most people, and what would be the most effective ways of communicating what is available.

The best incentives are safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, low transit fares and fast transit service. Expand WES hours and extend it to Salem.

The past suggestions of "jitney" systems were not widely accepted but with the technology of calling for transportation by cell phone has great potential.

Again, lower mass transit fares are key. Carsharing and carpools are great resources as well. Making sure neighborhoods are set up in a way where people can walk to services they need, i.e. supermarket, pharmacy, etc, makes it more likely that they will walk. If there was a more tangible incentive to use alternative modes of transportation, like a tax credit or something, I think it would be more appealing to some.

Car pools are not likely to be a great sell. Americans do not like strangers in their space and I doubt you can sell this one to very many folks. It seems like a good idea but culturally I do not think it will fly.

Carbon foot print.

Encourage car pooling. My father-in-law was in the same car pool for over 25 years in the Wash. DC area. Maybe this could happen more here if encouraged.

HOV lanes. Plain and simple.

How to actually engage people to do these things.

How to best get young people to use mass transit.

How to make this attractive for the general public. Having carpool parking only would be a real advantage.

I'm curious about what the travel options might be.

Instead of car-free apartment buildings, i believe there should be one carshare place per every 'x' number of apartments inside the building. zip car probably has the data to determine what 'x' should be. people DO need vehicles occasionally, and it would be awful to have a number of rarely-used cars parked in front of homes in the neighborhood.

My sister earns a great salary and is given a yearly Tri-Met pass for free, yet she drives every day. She uses Tri-Met only on weekends when she wants to go into downtown. How fair is that? How about giving a tri-met pass to people who need it, like poor people earning minimum wage?

Pay attention to what and where the transportation patterns are changing.

Since 90% of Portland area residents use cars every day to commute to work, to recreate, visit friends, and shop, we should promote ride sharing as much as possible at major employers such as Intel, Nike, Addidas, the universities, and downtown financial institutions such as US Bank and Wells Fargo.
Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits - Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles - Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit - Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life - Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals - Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency.

The more incentives people have for using alternative transportation, the better. Make it appealing, inviting, easy, rewarding from as many aspects as possible. Save time, money, effort. Enhance self-identity, values, desired outcomes. Discover more rewards than appear at first thoughts.

There would need to be a real commitment here, as opposed to half-hearted previous attempts. The push needs to be felt on all types of media (radio/TV/web/social networks), and in schools (make active transport a goal for our children, instead of making "my first car" the goal).

Use all types of media, particularly on transit vehicles and at transit stations and stops.

You have not included land-use planning and its considerable impact on vmt.

Again, incentives should not be targeted at middle and upper class folks who use transit, but at making the system more effective for lower income consumers.

If the transit was better and more complete (see response to previous transit-specific question) I think ridership would increase dramatically. As it is, with its limited hours and service (especially late, affecting service industry workers and businesses and patrons) it’s not a valid option for those who would benefit from and need it most. Seriously, go to any bar and ask your server if they’ve ever been stuck across town all night because they missed a bus. I think Zipcar and Car2Go have been great for Portland. It makes it possible (even if only mentally) to not own a car if you don’t have need for one on a regular basis. I’m not so sure about programs like Uber and Lyft. It seems predatory and like it has the potential to damage the livelihoods of regulated cab drivers who are supporting their families. I would have to learn more about this issue to form an opinion.

Raise gas tax, expand paid parking, raise taxes on surface parking lots, provide parking incentives for car-pooling. Pro-rate vehicle registration by weight and fuel efficiency (the heavier the vehicle, the more you pay).

Raise parking fees and expand pay-to-park throughout the city. Raise taxes on surface parking lots to promote redevelopment. Combine this with incentives for carpool, carshare and vanpool. Use increased revenues to subsidize transit, including passes for students and bike/ped projects.

Again, keep spending in check but keeping the public informed of transportation options is always a good idea.
Anything that reduces traffic volume is a good thing for economic/time efficiency and reduction of air pollution.

As long as a financial evaluation has been performed that shows a cost-benefit. Not a emotional-benefit.

Carpools, vanpools and car sharing can mitigate TriMet's horrible lack of service to suburban residential and business locations.

Does it make sense for the dollars.

Education/incentives through work/school.

Employers could give a bonus to new hires who move to be closer to work.

Encourage corporate assistance with transit passes.

Focus on making a comprehensive network.

Funding must not be regressive.

Have to get people convinced these are convenient and worthwhile.

I am opposed however to these uber cabs.

I believe the fares on TriMet are unreasonably LOW. Moreover, parking should not be free at MAX stations. Greater use of buses would move more people more efficiently than new rail lines or streetcars.

Mass transportation needs to be more frequent and more accessible if you want less cars on the road.

More car access to public transit. Expand the parking lot at Sunset transit center for example. I'm not going to ride my bike or take the bus there, and I think 95% of my fellow riders say the same thing. There's no shower at my office, it's dark and wet when I'm coming and going, so biking is not an option. And the bus connections are a joke so let's not even go there.

My answer is really a maybe. Some stuff that looks good on paper just doesn't work and cause un intended consequences.. if u want to cut down emissions build more roads so traffic can move.

Need to reduce traffic -- see previous answers. Reduce environmental pollution; address climate change. Need to do this NOW and DRAMATICALLY.

Publicity, publicity, publicity! Lots of small signs, notices in neighborhood papers, bus posters, mass mailings, etc., whenever options change so EVERYONE knows about them, and knows how they work.

Raise the gas tax - that's all it takes!

See previous responses.

Smart phone Apps are a great start. Beyond that , I don't think "lack of information" is a big issue right now.

Taxing forms of transportation other than cars.

We should be using smart Jitneys which collect people going to the same destinations at the same time.

Efficiency and cost.

How to disseminate the necessary information.
Make public transit less expensive - I can actually drive my prius to work and back everyday for far less than it would cost me to ride tri-met everyday. Also, as an employer, I can't afford to provide tri-met passes to employees as a benefit, because they are so expensive - employer discounts for benefit programs should be better.

This is all good stuff but not as important as the former items on the list.

Too much emphasis is placed on bicycles.

Variety of choices is good.

Educating the public. Public service announcements.

Getting the word out to communities would be a good way to encourage active transportation models. Perhaps aligning with neighborhood associations to teach each member of the community the options they have for travel around the region.

If the options are pollution-limited.

There's a lot of information now, but there are so many proliferating venues (electronically) that it's hard for some people to find a complete or updated source. Could there be an ombudsperson phone number that correlates info.?

Actual improvements in safety and efficiency are more effective than PR.

Ad campaigns, posters, educating school kids, requiring bicycle education. Target the users or potential users.

And don't forget that often the best incentive for alternative ideas is to provide disincentives for driving alone. Toll the bridges, tunnel, etc.

Do this in close dialogue with community-- the complaint often seems to be a lack of input or listening to locals. Doesn't mean that larger area-wide priorities are not emphasized, just engage more and be more visible. Also the issues that are often behind why transit is rejected needs addressing-- that "those people" will come into the community, causing theft and other crimes, has racial and ethnic undertones that never seem to be talked about. Somehow this major underlying issue needs to be brought into the discussion.

Education is more cost effective than infrastructure when it comes to safety. require proof of knowledge of basic rules of the road to renew drivers licence (testing).

Especially where increased density is being encouraged. We should not be building apartments/ condos that have no parking requirements without landlords being able to prove they are renting at least a sizable percentage to non-car owning tenants, or are providing reasonable incentives to attract non-car owners - lockable bike storage, car-sharing immediately adjacent to building.

Get more people on the bus.

Incentives need to include tolls once Washington drivers enter Oregon and/or fees to drive/park a car within some defined area (maybe the downtown core).
Incentives would be amazing!

P.O.V.'s with manual transmissions!

Single occupancy cars are a tragic thing.

Sure - no real opinion - seems to be fitting with the rest of the initiatives.

Tax gas (and use the revenue to maintain transportation infrastructure, not build new stuff) until people stop using their cars for every little errand.

The concept that alternative transportation options are good for families and good for health should be promoted. It should be safe for kids to walk or bike to school and parents should be encouraged to let there kids walk or bike. I'm in inner the inner Eastside and always have been shocked at how many parents drive their kids a short distance to school. That should be an exception to typical circumstances.

Yes and no on this one. The HOV lane on I-5 northbound to Vancouver doesn't seem to help. I don't commute to Vancouver, but I have family there that I visit frequently. From about 1-2 pm forward, the traffic northbound is backed up. The HOV lane is practically empty. Either build another lane or remove the HOV lane.

I wouldn't waste ads on television ads to newspaper. Use billboards and busses, max cars.

My roommate had a job that was far away and his employer provided bus passes at a discount or for free. I think encouraging employers, or giving tax breaks, to offer this kind of incentive to use transit is great. Currently I am working a split shift and driving about 80 miles a day. I thought that I could commute to and from work in the middle of the day by bus and save money doing it. I bought some bus tickets but the increased fares have created a situation where riding the bus is not any cheaper than driving and it takes twice as long.

Provide incentives to employers for them to provide incentives and rewards to their employees (for example, they might provide their employees with free TriMet pass in lieu of a free parking space).

Expanding the transit system to include furthest reaches of east Multnoamah county and the surrounding communities.

Tax breaks for bicyclists.

Assume that people are eager to walk or bike (and they really are, while our built environment discourages these activities) instead of always assuming people would rather drive. Otherwise you just perpetuate the auto-centric disaster.

Can you give us some substance with the questions.

Continue to expand programs with trimet and others for area employers.

Depends on what you mean by incentive. A dedicated bike path from home to work is all the incentive I need. I support this kind of incentive. Direct payments to people to encourage them to use bad systems is not so great and a misappropriation of funds.
Education and marketing must go hand in hand.

Expanding available public transportation!

Find more ways to combat the suburban/rural opposition to public transit: better public education, enlisting the support of businesses, community groups and leaders in those areas.

Increase use of Internet to provide and exchange real-time transportation information for local and regional travelers. Accelerate and legalize means for cooperative/joint travel like sharing transportation means among neighbors, friends, business associates and strangers. Try to make sharing the preferred mode by making it culturally preferred.

Information is readily available, but incentives need to be expanded. Increase disincentives for driving; make transit more accessible and less expensive, especially in the burbs. Washington DC area provides a free service to get you home in an emergency if you carpool or take transit. Have a contest to invent more incentives; tie incentives to taking initiative to get the info for your transit route; whatever it takes to get convert drivers to riders!

Require businesses to provide subsidies to all workers for bus passes and incentives for walking or biking to work. Make your public awareness campaign smart, not cutesy.

This is a given in any effort to increase travel efficiencies and reduce single-person car trips.

This should be a no-brainer in government and private sectors. Yes, please give incentives. Commercial business should understand the benefit of healthy consumers - traveling, working and yes spending locally - along with the social advantages of sharing transportation alternatives. It promotes a healthy lifestyle, a healthy environment, and saves on costs associated with unhealthy lifestyles and unhealthy environments - costs that are local, regional, national and global!

Use public funds to support private enterprise efforts- e.g. SmartCar, Zipcar, BikeShare, While I don't use vanpools/carpools....I can easily imagine a 'app' that links drivers with those who're look for a lift- e.g.

Focusing the campaign on youth will have the best long-term adoption rate.

Funding availability and citizen priorities.

My real answer is maybe.

Again, governments waste tremendous amounts of money- it is trickle down waste, starting with the federal government. Government subsidies of mass transit, in order to make travel available to everyone, might be a cost-effective way to "waste" money.

Be open to new ideas. Spur private companies in addition to public transit options.

Businesses who match employees cost for transit should be the norm. Figure out a way to make this a preferred option for businesses. The behavior of single occupancy driving has to change in order to improve travel in our region.
Continue to address the difficulties we face with the wide scattering of jobs versus the areas where those job holders live. I am not sure this can ever be resolved under our present form of government (which I want to maintain).

Cost, availability and better access.

Educate, educate, educate. Cover person economics and expand people's ideas about their zone of influence and zone of concern from the common myopic view to the level regional and global concern.

Help businesses design programs to meet the needs of their workers. Not every business needs the same thing--help them find the best combo of options given their location and where their workers are coming from.

Monetary incentives are especially important.

Not as big of a deal as the others so far.

Not to individuals but to entrepreneurs and businesses.

Problem most people avoid the message.

Targeting home to work transit ways.

To make this work, communication is key.

We need to do all we can to increase the number of passengers in vehicles.

More busses.

People need help reducing single occupancy vehicle trips.

It seems that many people don’t know that alternate transportation means are an option. I have a co-worker who lives about a mile from the office; she drives to work every day. My suggestion that she could walk or bike and save hundreds a year in gas and parking fees came as a shock to her as if she’d never even thought of it before. Let’s get the word out that bike lanes are generally safe and that, contrary to stereotypes, public transit can be for everyone, not just the homeless or mentally ill.

I live in a nearby Oregon city, and it would greatly increase the number of trips I make into Portland if rideshares were available.

Needs to be a holistic strategy to provide a useable transportation system including the road system while encouraging people to use alternative means of transportation to keep car use at a minimum.

People need to know what's available, but this should be a small part of the budget.

Partner with business! Limit expense of communication and incentives for population segments of untested or poor use until return on investment is assessed to be reasonable or exceptional.

This is really a maybe. This is either ITS or mass transit or ped lanes. Seems redundant. For adaptation, keep in mind that all roads work for bikes and vehicles that have access to power. Really the investment should be to aggregate people, have them use their own power or streamline freight.
Better ways of getting from Vancouver, WA to Portland, OR and vice versa would be helpful. Personal walking, bicycling and public transport only. Too many crazies for ride share ideas. Cost to lower middle and lower income families. Yes, but also include low EV emissions vehicles. Incentives could be low cost such as allowing access to HOV for single passenger hybrid or electric vehicles. Public transit is critical. Not everyone can or will bike; weather is an issue; speed and connectivity are big issues for livability. Travel smart programs, coupled with basic infrastructure before capacity improvements and increased transit are some of the lower cost ways to achieve the climate change goals. CRIME!!! While I would commute regardless, when there are incentives it makes me commute via bike even more. I'm willing to do it in rainy days versus just nice days if I need to make a minimum to get an incentive. Provide interactive maps from and to locations for people to find share opportunities. Are areas close to schools? Kids should get priority and we should encourage safe ways for kids to walk and bike to their schools. But more importantly there should be systemic disincentives to regular use of personal vehicles. Such options could include cheaper rent in inner Portland for renters who don't own cars, increased taxes on individual vehicles that are not a necessity for work, a more efficient commute by bus, prioritizing public transportation in traffic planning, employer support to employees choosing alternative means of transportation during the work day and commuting to and from work. Cost effective incentives. Digital technology should be able to build "on the run" travel matching systems making car pooling and car sharing more accessible and intuitive. If we can waste a quarter billion on Oregon's Obamacare, maybe a couple million on websites and related technology to connect commuters would be money well spent. Each different type of area requires different approaches. Bike lanes with 3 foot distance passing requirements for cars in some areas. Mass transit to mini-town hubs where almost all needed consumables can be purchased and return home without a car. Multi-faceted approach. Ending vehicle CO2 emissions to mitigate climate change...if that is possible. Examine other communities (including foreign) use of regulated private ad hoc jitney services. This is a very exciting area, especially with so many people carrying a smart phone with pinpoint location accuracy. I work for a nonprofit, so please consider small budgets into this plan. It's true not everyone can get around by bicycle - but many more can than currently choose to. Bus rapid transit! That's the way to go - more flexible than a MAX track, better service, and much more affordable. Make parking on street [and lots] more expensive and use that income the fund the alternatives initially.
More investment- sure, but maybe not as easy as one thinks.
Participation of community groups and large employers
Partnering with certain large employers in the area (e.g., Nike, Columbia, OHSU) to set up ride share and carpooling programs.
Programs like the Bike Commute Challenge work well. Publicize these successful programs and do more of what resonates with people.
Subsidize public transit, tax driving (vehicle miles traveled).
The fights already happening about car sharing platforms like UBER. People love it, Taxi companies don't. Governments don't like losing taxes from Taxi companies.
This has the greatest potential for return on investment.
TV advertising, as well as educating the public through available avenues.
Yes, I support this, but for me it is less of a priority than preceding items 1-4. I don't think the public lacks information; I think the problem is that the public doesn't perceive the transportation system sufficiently safe for walking and cycling. Tri-Met defunded a few years ago, and now their various buses don't connect well. For example, it now takes 45 minutes for me to go from Garden Home to PCC Sylvania because the #45 and the #44 schedules through Multnomah Village are incompatible. Also, some buses run rarely--#45 Garden Home. And the $2.50 far is pretty high compared to other cities. (Is Portland more spread out?) Bring back the the 1 zone fare for short hops. The ticket should allow there-and-back within 2 hrs for a quick stop somewhere. I used to take the bus all the time but stopped when service was cut and fares increased. Now I can bike from Beaverton to NE Alberta often faster than I can take the bus, but the bus would be nice on a really rainy day.

"Bikers ride free on TriMet!" People don't want their CARS, they want the FREEDOM that a car gives them. TriMet means being dependent. Having a bike fixes that. There's a space issue, but maybe one of you is more clever than I and can solve that one.
Allowing experimentation in transit options.
Examine other communities' (including foreign) use of regulated private ad hoc jitney services. This is a very exciting area, especially with so many people carrying a smart phone with pinpoint location accuracy.
I don't support vanpools except where the population numbers don't support buses or rail. However, we need commuter rail or BRT between Salem and Portland.
I ride the bus home every day. There are 50 people on the bus, but we get stuck in traffic. Why? Personal vehicles with 1 person in the zoom past us, coming off the highway, to get stuck in a car traffic jam. These people are greedy and lazy. The vast majority of drivers can ride the bus. Think about what all that bus ticket revenue could do for the system.

I support car pooling and other ride sharing.
It makes sense to consider and respect peoples timing how to get from one place to another. It's true not everyone can get around by bicycle - but many more can than currently choose to. Bus rapid transit! That's the way to go - more flexible than a MAX track, better service, and much more affordable.

Main focus on biking and walking.

ODOT should consider widening freeways to add HOV lanes.

Raise the cost of parking.

See comment immediately above.

That all alternative drivers have insurance, seat belts, etc.

The fights already happening about car sharing platforms like UBER. People love it, Taxi companies don't. Governments don't like losing taxes from Taxi companies.

These questions are pretty vague. If you are trying to find alternatives for automobile transportation, good luck. Senior citizens who don't live close to mass transit are pretty much stuck in autos, whether they be their own cars or calling a cab. Young parents with multiple children aren't likely to be using Smart Cars or bikes to get their kids to daycare or school, especially not bicycles in inclement weather. What do you mean by incentives?

This has the greatest potential for return on investment.

TV advertising, as well as educating the public through available avenues.

Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 5:

1. Plenty of options already out there. any idiot can figure out how to ride a bike, what bus route to take, or a better route to take to work.
2. It all sounds like marketing, and doesn't help those of us in rural areas.
3. I think this is already being promoted enough. This budget should not be enlarged at all.
4. It should be an individual's decision and public money should not be spent on incentive programs. Fix the roads first, money left over can go to pet projects.
5. Either you get it, or you don't. Private autos are used primarily for convenience, and time saving. Just look at the Westside Bypass-it doesn't exist for several reasons. It'd be great having quick mass transit from S.W. Portland to Sherwood/Newberg, but not in our lifetimes.
6. Is there anybody out there who isn't aware of the choices? I don't think so.
7. There is already plenty of information available, the only thing is to make it more readily available and economically advertised.
8. Sounds good, is relatively cheap and easy, but will have limited impact. There's no getting around the need to invest real money in infrastructure.
9. Are people not capable of managing their lives themselves? People are quite innovative, and can most certainly find ways on their own to carpool and make it from point A to point B, dontcha think?
I think if the price of driving (in road repairs, maintenance, etc...) is accurately reflected in user fees and gas tax then that will be incentive enough. I can't help but think drivers are subsidized and not paying the true costs associated with roads. And I'm a driver, albeit a light one.

If it is cost and time efficient consumers will naturally use those options. Using tax payer dollars to encourage a cost inefficient measure is bad policy.

Incentives don't change what people can do, just give away money to people already doing something. incentives don't help solve expanding need and growth demands on roads and transit.

No. People know. It's a matter of making NOT doing the more community-friendly options more painful. You need disincentives to continue the status quo, not bribes toward desired behavior.

People have enough information and usually make the best decision for themselves. Most don't need government agents to think for them.

Some people will appreciate the incentives, but usually it's the people already inclined toward car pools and biking.

The cost to tax payers and the bad economy.

Incentives don't change what people can do, just give away money to people already doing something. incentives don't help solve expanding need and growth demands on roads and transit.

No. People know. It's a matter of making NOT doing the more community-friendly options more painful. You need disincentives to continue the status quo, not bribes toward desired behavior.

People have enough information and usually make the best decision for themselves. Most don't need government agents to think for them.

Some people will appreciate the incentives, but usually it's the people already inclined toward car pools and biking.

The cost to tax payers and the bad economy.

The public knows what works. The government does not. One of the worst ideas ever is carpool lanes. Government decides to deny the largest % of those using the highway a resource that they've paid for. Please, learn some respect and humility and stop all efforts at social engineering through selective punishments.

This is a low priority for me. experience suggests that people will drive because it is so convenient. this policy would not really address that.

Current policy is adequate.

I believe an efficient and effective transportation system sells itself. If its usefulness is not self-evident, it probably isn't as useful as it should be.

just robbing Peter to pay Paul. I don't think incentives work, but the management of them is a drain.

NO. No more "incentives" that I end up having to pay for!

the government should never be in the business of rewarding with incentives.

There is enough information out there already.

We already have these and have spent a huge sum of resources promoting.

What people are willing to pay for and what they are not.

You cannot provide enough incentive for me to ride a bicycle in Portland / Beaverton traffic. Are you mad?

For those that are young and live close to their jobs (if they have one) it is fine to walk and bike. Transit is terrible. To get from Beaverton (Wash Sg) to NW Portland is an hour and thirty minutes minimum and two hours to get home. Is that quality of life. I own a home. I'm not about to pick up and move closer to work, and I surely can't find a job out where I live. This program has merit, but should not forced on everyone.
No. This only works for folks who live in urban areas and actually have transportation options available. Elitist.

Whether these are actually viable transportation options for real people, or whether they just make politicians feel good.

Government should not spend money to induce people to change their behaviors.

I live outside an area where this would be a benefit. People run errands on their way to and from work. Park and rides at the edge of the cities might be of benefit, but single patron cars will drive there.

Information yes, incentives...not really.

I doubt lack of information has much effect. Improving the choices would be a better plan.

Create a freeway from Portland to Mt. Hood as was planned years ago.

I believe that individuals will establish patterns that best serve their interests.

I believe that if there was better utilization of the current funds and thinking "out side of the box" adequate information dissemination of this information could be taking place now.

It been tried in the past...DOES NOT WORK!

People are aware of the options.

Carpools and vanpools - although a nice idea, simply do not work.

Communities know what options are available. Not all communities have access to public transportation.

Don't we already know how to find a bus to ride? Not sure what the point of this would be.

Economy will drive use. It needs to make economic sense to work people will use public transit only if is practical to do so and convenient.

Has been tried and does not work.

Information and incentives are already available.

Not really, we should try to make the existing system work better, we have billions invested in MAX and the streetcar and other infrastructure, lets wring every last bit of use and efficiency from the current system before we run off and build new items.

The information is already out there.

This hasn't work. Move on!

This is not necessary. Governance should start thinking about ways to save money, not spend it unnecessarily!

While having travel options is very important, having government spend money providing info is very inefficient. A better strategy is to reduce the regulatory burden on people who want to car share and use services like Uber. Also, private bus companies should be welcomed and not overly regulated if they want to provide service in certain areas.

People know they have options.
People know what to do...they won't do it if it's not available....other use of money provides the means.

People will either use it or not use it and no one can talk them into it. Tried to talk people into using buses with me for over 30 years with little success.

Too broad.

I Believe ride sharing, use of public transit and alternative transportation that lessens the number of vehicle on the road can be encouraged through NOT penalizing or restricting Ride programs such as UBER, LOWERING the costs and/or hassle of using public transit, and encouraging ride sharing, carpooling and alternative transportation by allowing tax reductions and/or write offs to those who practice such behavior at NO TAX INCREASE to existing drivers who may choose to continue driving solo and not changing their habits.

There are already a ton of these programs.

Already being done. No more money.

Current level is plenty.

Don't try and tell me how to travel. I will make my own rational decision on it. Spending money to fund government staff to manage and implement an incentive system that will yield at best marginal improvements without measuring the true costs is a poor use of resources and bad implementation.

I think money would be better spent on other policies prior to this question.

I wouldn't spend much time or money on this except many car sharing.

Money can be better spent elsewhere. The policy is flawed.

People do all of these efficiency efforts now. They are cost and convenience conscience and don't need advertising blitzes to make them informed. What kind of incentives are you considering? Car pooling for example has its own builtin incentives.

People have the information they need now.

There is only so much that can be done in providing information and incentives and if through redirecting investment dollars away from fixing real serious congestion bottlenecks is like not understanding, when someone is Bleeding to Death and/or is Not Breathing, you do not start with a Physiologist to figure out how it happen.

This is exactly what I'm talking about. It is not government's role to push us into using transportation that is inconvenient, expensive and unwanted.

We don't need money-wasting add campaigns. People know how to find the info they need.

PEOPLE OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO RETAIN THEIR FREEDOM, NOT BE FORCED INTO COMMUNALISM AGAINST THEIR WILL ONLY BECAUSE IT IS YOUR WILL.

I find it very hard to understand that anyone could lack information on the systems and availability. At some point, continuing to "pound" the message becomes redundant and counterproductive. Spend on facilities!
If it's not practical for people to ride-share or give up their car, they aren't going to do it for incentives. Public relations and providing information is a huge waste of money. If something new and useful is available, people will hear about it and use it. The market will take care of this, doesn't need to be a government function.

There is already enough emphasis on this besides the economic of the suggestion: "road diets" are already part of the mix in sucking more time out of my day. In the desire to make public transportation the same time as commuting in my car, Metro's and Portland's planners are coming mightily close. If you could jest get all of the bums off of the trains and busses and have it a place that I could feel safe traveling with my 7-year old, it might be different. Until there is a place where I don't find meth needles or have to suffer gang bangers and abusive teens, I will chose the relative safety of my vehicle along with its freedom of movement and carrying capacity.

"If you build it "correctly" they will come."

Current funding is adequate and appropriate.

If you want to waste time telling people to walk, bike etc. when we get rain 3/4 of the year knock yourself out. I am not falling for it. When you live 15+ miles from work and there is NO PUBLIC TRANSIT to your job you are not going to walk/bike to work. Cannot afford to move. Apartments are dangerous. Look at disease outbreaks now. Single family homes are a safer place for families to live to prevent the spread of disease. Metro is going to try to kill us all with their idea to force everyone into multi family housing. Shared air systems are a no-no to prevent disease. Get yourselves into the present and encourage single family homes for healthy Oregonians.

Not if it is going to be for light rail. Buses are more cost effective and flexible.

$ should be used to keep roadways in total metro area usable before pushing travel options.

Allow those that desire to use this transportation and increase its use to do grass roots marketing to inform consumers.

Another example of government overreach. Let people use their own initiative (such as the internet) to meet their needs. Let transit companies provide schedules and maps and let government provide maps of cycle routes, that's all.

I can not support incentives... History shows the fraud and abuse that these types of systems create.

I feel that any incentives should come from companies offering it to the employees.

It is happening without the aid of regional investment. Personal choices is what drives these activities as it should.

Let the market determine this.

Let the market drive this. If an idea cannot stand on its own, maybe it shouldn't happen.
Most people in the region are pretty transit savvy, so don't waste money on unnecessary education. Apps are useful, though.

This has been done for years by cities and it's just not working. I think businesses should provide the information and incentives to their workers like many are doing now.

This is a good idea that is not often used by the public at large.

Waste of money people will do what they are capable of doing.

All of that has been tried many many times and it is not successful. Build Roads!

Waste of money people will do what they are capable of doing.

Investment in the transporation systems is the least efficient use of our capital money. The premises presented here is false. Investment in and expansion of the road systems will meet the goals. Spending money on public transporation options is the most expensive and doesn't provide better solutions for citizens to access the locations they desire to go.

Let the free market make their choice.

Craigslist is free. Viral marketing.

These have been around for a long time, they never work well and I do not believe they ever will.

Another waste of money. People will use the most convenient mode of transportation. We need to make car commuting unpleasant.

Enough incentives are in place already. JUST MAKE THE OPTIONS SAFER .. SAFETY FIRST .. PUT REAL TIME CAMERAS ON EVERY BUS AND TRAIN. HAVE SAFETY OFFICERS ON THE TRAIN, INSTEAD OF DRIVING AROUND IN CARS.

I don't believe people in general are willing to give up their individual cars. Jobs are too spread out to make vanpools efficient; that would be better done under larger employers. There is already plenty of info about public transit, but until Trimet improves their operating and attitudes of drivers, more ads will not help.

Respond to citizen's demands, rather than using incentives to influence their travel choices.

There is plenty of information about this out there. Unless Portland is going to permit more carsharing companies to operate in the city.

This is mostly a waste of money. Let it get totally congested. Then, and only then will employees demand and employers grant, work-from-home days.

Waste of money.

Avoid social engineering schemes.

Stupid.

What about all the people who work from home or do not work? What is the perk for them? If I carpool to preschool or church, what do I gain?

Don't waste the money because the investment does not make sense.

Look to places with a long history of public transportation for ideas; i.e. London.
People who buy into it already do it. Those that don't never will as decades of history demonstrates all over the US.

Stop using the gas taxes for bikes etc. gas taxes should pay for roads only!

There are those who believe in these alternatives and those who don't. More information or incentives will not convince those who don't to do so. They want their private vehicle and will drive it no matter what.

Anyone with a brain knows what transportation options are available. Do not spend any more money on this goal.

Let people decide what is best for them. They will find the information themselves.

Remove the HOV lane from I-5... it DESTROYS the use of that highway during rush hour.

The market will decide how people select travel options. Don't try to tell people what to do.

"Incentives" in this context normally means punishing/taxing/assessing fees on all drivers instead of providing some type of positive incentive to carpool, walk or bike. ALSO AVOID ROAD TOLLS! You also must understand that walking and biking are not necessarily safe because of the criminals that frequent the walking and biking paths (murderers, rapists, thieves, etc.). Do your homework and figure out what the real safety issues are.

Current methods and measures seem appropriate.

Fix and update what we have before adding more travel options.

I will not support adding more fees, etc. to vehicle use. We need to make people want to use alternate sources.... peer pressure to use.

Information and incentives are not going to change the way people decide to travel.

Is there any proof of a high benefit cost on this?

IT rains in Oregon!!! I am not riding my bike in the rain!!! I am not carpooling because I have other things to do when going home. I have a life and waiting for someone else or a bus for 2 hours when I can be home in 30 minutes is silly to me.

No.  Too much social engineering to use my tax dollars to alter people's choices. Provide the options. An individual makes and pays for the choices they make.

Seems we have enough currently.

Stop spending too much on the small percentage of people who use these options. The people who want to use these are, those who don't, won't.

This is a good idea. What prevents me from carsharing/pooling sharing is convenience and time of day each person needs to commute. If there was a community effort where you could hook up with someone via website that happens to share your exact commute I would need a way to verify they are a credible person and safe driver and feel that the website organizing this has my safety in mind.

We need to provide safe means to walk or ride bikes before we ask people to use them.
These are nothing but money pits. If the already heavily subsidized transit systems do not already attract users throwing more of the taxpayers money at it will not help. And of course, as soon as those new incentives run out the new riders will return to their previous means of transportation. This will result in a perpetual use of incentives to shore up a failed mass transit system.

These are two separate questions, children. 1. Do we provide more information? I could live with that. Do we use incentives? No, because local agencies within the Portland metroplex have generally done a poor job of determining who should get the subsidies.

The is no point in providing information and incentives until you have a viable system that works for everyone. Americans (aside from those who already embrace alternative transportation philosophically and in reality) take driving as a right, and unless you can offer them the same convenience with the above mentioned alternatives, no amount of information nor incentive will sway them from this fundamental right. That just seems like a waste of funds that could be channeled toward making the alternatives as convenient and even more attractive than driving.

These are, or could be commercial endeavors and could be marketed by the business.

This has not really worked for all the years that it has been in place. That lane for commuters with more than 3 in the car on I5 is a waste. It slows up all traffic because most are relegated to only 2 lanes because of it.

Government involvement is not needed or wanted in these areas. Also, allow Uber to operate in PDX.

I really don't think most people are unaware. They just have more convenient or affordable options so would work on making the other options cheaper and better. Little marketing is needed, but good services are.

Improve our highways and freeways.

It is not the role of government to tell us how to travel.

People know how to get around, government doesn't need to spend money to tell them.

These are already well known. It will take attitude change not knowledge.

This is something private industry and nonprofits can do. But government can require real-estate listings to include transit information. Too many people buy a house without giving this a thought.

Within their first week of moving to the Portland metro region, most self-sufficient travelers will learn the most efficient and appealing options for getting where they need to be. Beyond that, such information quickly becomes unwelcome noise.

Bike maps provided at all libraries, same with local bus schedules. Walking happens because we have to or we want to, no need for more funding. Car sharing is growing in Portland, but along with carpools and vanpools these things grow through word of mouth and are probably not that big on involving strangers, so this would not be a priority for me as far as funding - at the same time I appreciate all of these things that are happening through people making contact at work, school, etc.
For the most part these sorts of programs are a waste of time and money. Nobody carpools because of incentives - they carpool because they can stand to ride together and it is convenient. Incentives would have to be clear, and monetary - and probably too expensive. However, a good use of such money would be to help people live near where they work - and to make it easier to take public transportation than to drive.

Government promotion of other travel options is ineffective. People can figure this out for themselves.

I don't think more investment in providing information is needed, but am supportive of these options. We're doing pretty well already, would prefer investment be targeted to road maintenance and increased transit.

I think behavioral modification efforts to encourage alternative mode usage are a waste. It would be much more productive to spend this money actually designing and building facilities.

I think the market can take care of these type of options, and additional government incentives may be unnecessary.

I think there is enough information out there on these options. Please direct funds to actually doing things - e.g. implementing traffic calming, providing incentives to car-sharing startups, etc.

I'm not sure that public education in this area is going to effectively change long-ingrained habits. Make walking, biking and public transport more available, faster and more convenient, and people will try it out. No preachy ad campaign or well-intentioned websites, please.

Just do what's right & don't worry about the people. What must be done must be done. Announce it in the paper, people will be mad but they'll get over it. Especially when it WORKS.

Just isn't very efficient. Too many different work hours and job locations to make much of an impact.

People are going to do what they will.

The best incentives for bike/walking/transit are safe routes to desirable destinations with convenient travel times.

The city's policy of allowing huge apartment buildings without parking should be incentive enough for those people to look for their own options. (Or was this a big scam on the part of the city all along to find more ways to waste money?)

These programs are good, but ultimately people will make decisions based on what is most convenient for them. I think limited funds could be better spent on capital projects.

I feel more energy should go into building durable, desirable alternative transportation networks rather than frittering large portions of the budget away on ephemeral behavior campaigns.

I have never once found carpooling or van pooling that met my needs or worked for me. I like the IDEA of van pooling. The only bicycling I'll willingly do is on car-free pathways. Looking forward to North Portland Greenway Trail. It seems to be taking for ever to be done.
If you build the infrastructure right, then everyone is going to make use of it. Web site designers, advertising campaigns, and so on are parasitic costs that good transportation strategy does not need. You can count on the free market to come up with ways to blow your horn for you—provided you actually do the job right and there is something to shout about.

When I was growing up, annual incomes over $250,000 were taxed at 91%. Unless there is an adequate tax base to support public infrastructure, additional investments are consistently too little too late. Failure to promote progressive taxation undermines all government services.

I support transportation funds being used to maintain roads. MAX has not improved congestion. We already have all of these options. I drive because it saves time. It doesn't matter how much information you provide to me about other options I will continue to drive.

We should not use tax dollars to incent modes of transit above and beyond the subsidies mass transit already receives.

If it's convenient people will use it. This is an area where costs might be saved.

Better to spend money actually making the options available than advertising them.

Doesn't seem like the best use of funds. I think people generally know their options.

I think cost and convenience are going to determine travel methods people use, no matter how much info we provide. Increasing the gas tax would create incentive for all the options listed.

I think people will use these modes when it is convenient and affordable not because of TV or radio advertising.

If someone wants to drive themselves to work and the grocery store, no amount of incentive will sway them.

If transportation costs are right, you may not need to spend much on public persuasion. Transportation should be more heavily subsidized.

People are not going to carpool because you give them money. There are bigger issues afoot here. One of them is that most of the people who are driving into SE and NE are people who have been forced out by raising rent prices and all of the building that is going on of $1200 a month apartments. The people who are driving work in coffee shops and markets and cannot live where they work. Please do not spend the city money to make people feel better about biking to work. Please spend it to, in some way, keep rents down so that the people who live here can keep living here.

The only 'incentive' should be safe and police-monitored street crossings and cheap, easy, frequent BUS transportation!

The system should be built to get rid of subsidy for car travel...beyond that, information and incentive programs are wasteful stopgaps for what should be built into the system.
This is a qualified no. People are so connected these days, the best travel options are not hard to find, and the incentives to use them arise naturally from the economics. On the other hand, targeted, proven campaigns can be a part of that. I just don't see this being a priority for public investment.

This should not be expensive. It is important to advertise the range of transportation options available but the only thing that will get people out of their cars is the availability of a less painful option.

We've been doing this for over 20 years. Keep it at the same level.

Where the money for this would come from is not being addressed.

Where's lots of information available already.

Without "incentives", this can be done without the level of wasteful spending you are positing for the other items in this survey. Without removing debt from our public spending, our system will collapse.

A boondoggle to provide additional financial incentives to get people out of cars and onto buses and trains.

Everybody that WANTS to use those extra options don't have problems finding out about them. Some people just don't realize that most people don't want to do that.

Honest benefit/cost.

Most of this stuff is less important than infrastructure except for transit. Transit information could be much improved.

Transportation dollars are better spent in building and maintaining roads, bike paths, etc. people aren't stupid and can figure out for themselves what travel options are best for them. cost and convenience are the two factors that people can figure out without the help of a government agency.

We have blown through too much money already in alternate transit and the number of people who travel this way is still tiny.

Write some fair questions! So much bias in these lame questions make me vomit a little in my mouth.

I think that there is a core group that wants to push their agenda through and those people are uniting and forget the rest of us and our opinions.

If the services/alternatives correctly meet the needs of citizens, then people will use them without need for incentives.

Investments should be made in building out the regional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit network, so that these networks are ready for people to use, rather than trying to convince people to use a network that may not yet be complete to a degree considered safe. If an incentive needs to be provided to encourage people to use non-single-auto modes, it should be enacted by pricing the single auto mode and thus creating a disincentive for that mode.

Making cars expensive and a hassle is the best way to incentivize those other things and that requires no investment. Higher gas taxes can pay for the investments in other categories and has the benefit of also incentivizing "travel options".
Spend the money on infrastructure not on middle class perks.

There is already enough.

We don't need to waste money on these kind of programs.

We have enough resources committed to this currently.

What kind of information and incentives besides already offered for decades?

I believe people will do what they want to do here.

I don't believe these campaigns make a difference, at the end of the day the travel option has to be convenient and make people feel comfortable utilizing them.

I think that has a low payoff.

I think this is a wonderful idea but I don't know if we need to spend money on it. Most people probably know someone who bike commutes or can even go into a bike shop for information. I think the money can be more wisely spent on improving the safety on the roads.

Information, incentives no. Incentives are just a nice word for coercive moves by a dictatorial government.

People continue to choose auto transportation for life reasons, NOT because of lack of info.

Providing information is fine - I've no real objection. but in prioritizing spending I think there is more benefit from actually creating the system that lets people move efficiently across different modes of transportation and people will start using them. Trying to do it in the opposite order just frustrates users who find the connections they need missing.

Stop creating more departments and jobs for paper pushers. Just keep our roads etc working and in repair and let adults figure things out.

The only incentives needed are managing what we already have better!

The programs should be as self sufficient as possible.

This would be a waste of tax payer's money. People will find information on their own if they need to get somewhere. Incentives may be an interesting way to go about it, but I would have to understand what kind of incentives you could provide. Tax credits? I think one should get tax credits if they can prove they own one or no cars.

What is the social benefit of moving people from fast, safe, efficient, low cost cars to alternatives that are either: slow, costly, dangerous, inconvenient.

How to achieve this within the existing funds (using the money efficiently, so as to leave more funds for other matters) - How to incorporate more market-driven innovations instead of bureaucracy-driven regulations (that are prone fostering waste and mediocrity).

Good info already available. Open source data will allow third parties to make it further available. Skip the marketing.

I am not convinced that Metro's spending on this kind of outreach gets results.
I think there is currently adequate information to expand the use of travel options. The challenge is changing the culture and impacting the values of the population. Not something you have the money or expertise to do. Use your money to improve the systems... that will attract more users.

I think we are fine in this area. Let the markets decide.

Is there data to suggest that greater information leads to more good outcomes? Does that data suggest that this money is better spent on infrastructure or on education?

One of the primary reasons the Portland-Metro area and Oregon have a lower average wage than much of the nation is the anti-car mindset imbedded local governments. This mindset that views bicyclists superior to drivers is no different than how the Nazis viewed and treated the Jews. There are far too many other transportation needs for the money to be wasted on programs like drive less and save more, especially when the title is not even a true statement in that all the program does is attempt move people to a transport option where the taxpayer subsidy is much higher than driving the same distance. Also, with such a shift, private sector jobs are eliminated replaced by more government jobs (such as in transit operations) growing government and costing the taxpayers more.

This kind of seems like a waste of money.

With financial resources in short supply and the subsidies already being spent on alternative transportation options, motorist paid user fees must be spent on road improvements only. A taxpayer transit subsidy of over 60 cents per passenger mile is already way too high. Alternative transport options need to become more financially self-sustainable with transit passengers paying for transit and bicyclists paying for bicycle infrastructure. It is called equity!

I only check no because the current investment on information around this seems adequate.

I'm not sure incentives work here. Lean on workplaces to help their workers.

Let the private sector drive this area.

Metro's incentive programs are manipulative and insufficiently transparent. I favor the dissemination of maps and little else.

Most people have more sense than our traffic engineers and can figure out which is the best mode of transportation and route to get from place to place. We don't need more waste on colorful brochures that wind up in the trash.

Not much impact for the dollars spent unless focusing an specific employers.

People know what's out there ... quit wasting money on PR.

Region should look at what is needed by private sector to facilitate marketing, information and incentives. Should also look at real-time technology and multimodal trip planning spending money on these types of investments rather than way its been done in the past. Need to move forward with thinking.
There is more information than is needed for people who desire to ride the bus, walk or ride. If they don't have access to a computer one can go to a local library and get anything they need to travel within the city.

Good infrastructure is its own incentive.

I support the modes, but don't want to see money spend on information or incentives.

I support these options but feel that the private sector can take care of a lot of this need.

I think people are "aware" of options like walking, they just suck as options. This money would be better channeled into lower bus fares/more buses.

I think there are enough incentives for those methods of travel in the current system. One primary disincentive is that it costs people closer to downtown (paying more taxes already) the same bus fare as it does for people in Clackamas. This makes it hard to spend $5 a day to ride a bus.

People already know all this-newcomers move here because it's already deep in the social structure.

Some people would love to share. I'm an introvert, so not so much. I'm neutral, but you didn't provide that option.

Advertising costs are outrageous, I don't think they really do anything.

Also important, but not top priority.

Encourage more transit ridership by making it economical to ride, by lowering fares.

I think by now most people are well aware of the options and have selected the ones that work for them. I support some investment in public information campaigns, but the question was whether we support "more" investment. I would prefer the investments go instead to infrastructure that supports walking, biking, and other reduced carbon travel modes.

Not governments job. Let non-profits educate and try to change peoples lifestyle. Government should not be in the job of telling people what they should do.

People already have the options they need/want.

Some investment yes. All of the above options will still be in the minority for a variety of reasons.

Stop trying to social engineer. You are not my mother.

Waste of time, money, and resources.

We want to use our cars as buses no longer go where needed due to light rail.

Am not sure how we can do more than we already do.

I think people are already aware of these options.

If you make it user friendly and advantageous, people will use it. I'd use mass transit if it was fast. I choose a much more costly alternative because I can't deal with the more than double commute time. I've even been offered free transit passes for the summer and still chose to drive because I just get too tired having to be out of bed an extra 45 minutes early and getting home to dinner an extra 45 minutes late.
What a waste!!! I get stupid flyers all the time (4-color, photos, etc.) telling me that I can walk! And it's healthy! Etc. Absolutely inane, only morons could benefit, and they won't read the stupid things. Waste waste waste. What's new?

Are these programs effective, i.e., do they change behavior? This should be piloted before any thing is done or before the public is asked for their input. My understanding is that similar education programs are not effective.

Basic info. In a tech society people should be able to find what they need. Believe people know the options without being told. Focus needs to be in areas of safety, convenience and efficiency. Only then will people make use of the options available. Disincentives may be more effective.

Er......really? We already have an unbelievably well-stocked information system in place. People have access to transit info and options across numerous platforms in Portland, as you can see by how many people are using it.

I support continuing to provide info, but not any expansion. There is more than enough info out there right now. And I'd need more info about the funding of any "incentives" before I'd support that.

I think it is happening anyway -- we have a concerned population. I think we should just spend the money building these options for people, not marketing them. As they are implemented they will be utilized. I do not support increasing the spending for marketing transportation options. I understand some is needed to make people aware of their options, but this can be accomplished without spending more, but rather remaining at current levels.

I'd rather money be spent on physical improvements such as more sidewalks.

I'm not sure that this is as effective of a use of dollars. Carpooling and carsharing only works in limited situations for those living and working in the same areas.

Insightful people figure it out without the government throwing money at it.

Motivation should be internal not external, it won't lead to lasting behavior change.

Not everyone is capable of carsharing, carpooling, walking, using the bus or bicycling to and from work. There has to be a happy medium somewhere. But, again, you already have the plan and you don't care about how anyone feels about this - don't you?!

Not until all streets are paved!

Only when all streets are paved and have sidewalk.

People are either going to use public transportation and/or cycling or they're not. I think incentives have relatively little impact for their cost. Put the money towards infrastructure. That would incentivize me more than prizes for riding my bike.

Should be driven by pricing signals.
There does not need to be incentives to get folks to do the right thing, let the "market" work; it is less expensive to use public transit in many instances than driving when considering all the combined costs of operating a car. If people had the street facilities (e.g. Complete Streets) they can make a choice then and do not need incentives. However without the necessary street facilities in many instances these dollars are not invested wisely.

This can be better done by a smartphone app written by someone else. Stay out of it.

Total waste of money to fund.

We have far too many PR flacks as it is; we certainly don't need more.

What the heck does this mean?

What would be the incentives? I think there is good information on google maps and trimet about how to get around.

Ban cars and it won't be necessary.

How effective have these activities been so far?

I think that there are enough ways to provide information and incentives to expand the use of travel options now if a person is really interested in finding them.

Let's take care of what we have first and make it more reliable and safe so that people will use it then have the larger discussion.

You aren't going to make people bike no matter how much you punish them.

I do not think it is an issue of availability which determines their use. It just is not convenient in the real, unpredictable schedule of the work day.

Means already exist for people wanting to use these options.

Parking is expensive and that is the best incentive etiquette carpool/ take public transit.

The market should drive these decisions. government already has too many people employed with our tax dollars in stupid role like Sunday Parkways.

Information is always good. Incentives are not needed for a system that meets the community needs and approval. Too much money is wasted on multiple systems over the same area traveled. Buses, trains, trollies, bikes, cars, are redundant. Buses and cars offer max. flexability for all areas and situations.

Public funds should be spent on infrastructure.

Should be a private industry function, not a government function.

Stop spreading politicized propaganda.

Stop wasting our money on economically unsustainable projects.

There are far better ways to improve urban mobility and access - apparently you don't know anything about any of them.
I don't think this is a priority for public dollars. People already know these options exist. It's not a matter of information - it's a matter of personal choice and logistics.

I don't think we need to push incentives until our communities are able to support walkable routes and safe cycling routes. The incentive to ride or walk will be a clear choice as fuel costs rise and congestion increases.

I think current levels of funding are adequate.

I think there's a lot of information out there - we need to work on improving what we already have.

If people want to do these things, they will do them without the government spending money to tell them to do them.

In my experience, spending here has little effect. People either already care about this, or they don't. I've seen little other than workplace incentives that work.

It is not the roll of government to tell people how they may move about the community!!!!!! Read the Constitution.

It's a waste of money.

People are smart enough to figure this out for themselves.

Private sector, not for government to get involved in.

The options are there and most people know about them. They are simply choosing not to use the alternatives. Let's not waste money on preaching to the choir. TriMet can run their own website. The cities can produce their own walking/biking maps. We don't even have a truly functional carpool/vanpool system.

This hasn't worked for our region - we have an incredibly poor carpool/vanpool system. Unless Metro is going to realize this, and purchase 1,500 vans for vanpool use, let's focus on other things.

This is a firm "No." Don't spend our limited funding trying to spoon-feed people information or engineer behavior. People can and should be responsible participants in this.

This should be done by the private sector.

We already have excellent informatic sources for these options.

We can do this ourselves, we do not need to use taxpayer money to arrange ride sharing, or biking to work. Are you listening to your own questions?

We have the options; we have spent millions on communicating the options. We still choose to drive; transit usage is not going up despite our "reputation". It's time to accept defeat in trying to force people to transit; it's time to accept that people ARE CHOOSING to drive.

Again, give us solutions that allow us to maintain our individuality. Without that, life becomes rather dull and uninspiring.

Another waste and subsidizing is a boondoggle...people need to pay their own way.

Current funding level is about right.
Government often does a poor job of picking the correct solutions that work for the most people. I'd rather see the incentives be correct. If mass transit is a good solution to get people to work, they will figure this out on their own and it shouldn't require big subsidies to make it work.

Incentives are used to sell inferior products. Make the product so good that people use it without incentives. Don't waste our tax dollars trying to convince somebody that something is good. If people aren't using it, it is useless, and you are pouring money down a black hole. WES is a perfect example of obtuse waste. $ 50,000 per month to maintain a moving roadblock that stops more people at every intersection it crosses than are riding on it.

It isn't always possible for employees or citizens to use these options. Please invest in our highways and freeways. I drive a Prius and am doing my part to keep the emissions out of our air. Please provide better highways and freeways that can keep up with traffic.

Just never gonna amoun to much in our society.

More information can be provided by the private sector. Smartphone apps, companies like Uber, etc. There are incentives enough without government getting in the way.

NO public money should go to "expanding the use of travel options." This is a matter for personal choice and the private sector to address.

People will use other modes when they are convenient.

Stop trying to force engineer society....nobody deserves subsidies....we are all broke and why should i pay money to peoe on loot rail or carpools...nobody is giving me money.

Stop trying to redistribute wealth...everyone should pay their share or should walk or bike.

Stop wasting tax dollars trying to get people to change their preferences. People will flock to a superior service or method of transportation. The free market will decide whether travel options are viable. It is not Government's job to determine how people get from one place to another. It is Government's job to make the free flow of commerce possible.

The geography of the Metro area and the impracticality of serving it with transit.

For the most part, people can figure out what's available, especially if it's on the internet. Put the money into creating the options and people will find them.

Honestly, I think employers should be doing more to incentivize this.

I see little help from this over the years. If folks see a better way to get to work, they are likely to take it. Advertising van pooling does not seem to be something I would like to pay for.

I think that this is a great idea and would support it, but with the infrastructure of our streets and max tracks not being where it really needs to be, I cannot support more investment at this time.

If people want these options they'll figure out how to use them.

Lower priority - let the private sector take the lead on this aspect.
Not until it is safe to use alternative methods. It is not currently.

People will drive or share as it is needed in their daily life. I prefer to drive and pay for the gas I consume. There is information out there, but the people that are too lazy to look into it will probably be too lazy to give up their cars and pursue any of the alternate options. Besides, if the prior policies aren’t implemented first, this policy will be less effective.

This is already being done. Don’t spend any more on it. We shouldn’t have to provide and incentive for people to make positive changes.

And why exactly is the government getting involved in this... it should be something employers do not the government.

Carpooling and ride-sharing initiatives have been in existence for 30 years in the US. If they do not catch on, it is not for lack of awareness, but for other reasons, such as incompatibility with people's commuting patterns. This should be undertaken by volunteer organizations, not by tax dollars.

I don't like "incentives" which actually means subsidies for a few individuals. If these are actually cost-effective and do not offset other programs that would improve traffic for a far greater number of people, then perhaps. But they must be clearly cost-effective. Some advertising, if it get the appropriate results, is probably warranted.

Let the value proposition of each options sell itself.

Looks like an unnecessary justification for Metro to waste money.

People don't need incentives; if the system is developed in a way that makes it easier and better to use public transit, they will use it.

People need cars not rapid transit which brings crime to a neighborhood near you.

Sounds good, but is generally a failure.

Stop spending money trying to get people to car share or pool. People have their own schedules and it's not a reality. Make bicyclists take a rules of the road class before they get any incentives.

The incentive should be convenience. A better system will be enough incentive.

The public will gravitate to the most cost effective and convenient options, so don't spend a significant amount of money incentivise.

This gets ridiculous.

This has been done to death in the past decades and NEVER seems to be very effective - have you ever suffered in a carpool? People do the cheapest, most efficient mode of transportation available without prompting in my experience.

This kind of planners-dream stuff should not be forced. Let them develop freely with market forces.

Waste of money.

Where is the personal incentive?
You'll use it to attack cars.

Carsharing, carpools etc. already have a benefit to the users. It costs them less to get where they are going. If people want to set something up, they can use Craigslist.com.

I think in more urban areas this makes sense but convenience has to be some importance for those who don't walk and stand on moving platforms so well.

I think we have seen that the ride share idea doesn't work that well. Options for transportation must be convenient and offer "door to door" access. Anything that involves long waits, riding to other destinations first, or long delays to get where you are headed will not get people out of their cars.

Let the private market do this. it will be more effective and tax payers won't have to pay for more PERS employees.

This is what people do already by themselves. We do not need public money to incentivise people.

Waste of time and money.

Yes in urban areas. However, this is not a one size fits all situation!

I do not believe incentives make people use other forms of transport.

I do not believe people really pay attention to ads enough to equal thxpense of such

Items 1-4 have considerable higher priority in my mind. Just the legal nightmarish possibilities of ride sharing make me look fondly at trolleys & computer directed roads & driving.

Sounds like it could lead to fraud, graft, and corruption.

I fail to understand METRO being so driven (What a pun) to suggest that their power is to shame people in doing everything but drive privately owned vehicles.. How is it the regional governments mission to do this instead of letting the citizens to decide on the choices above on their own?

The government has no business being in the travel business. Leave it to the private sector.

The fact that we have already put Max lines along most freeways and it has done nothing to reduce congestion.

The information is already out there if people want to know, spending money on this is a waste of money.

Hasn't this been done before? I don't think it was tremendously successful even in the 70's when the gas shortage shocked people to awareness.

I think enough is being spent on promotion of alternative travel options. That should be maintained. One thing that should be increased is encouragement not to let cars idle. Turn off engines while using phones, waiting for long trains to pass, waiting for passengers to arrive, etc.

Let the market decide which travel options are selected. Eliminate incentives altogether.

This relies on behavior changes that are not realistic given the current infrastructure, habits and options. It also unfairly shifts the burden of improving conditions onto individuals without the support of regulation and resources.
For all the answers I have previously written, it all applies to this too. For god's sake you can't fill a pot hole or pave a road here in Powellhurst/Gilbert. And you want to start something new?

I believe we've convinced as many people now that we can to walk, drive, or take mass transit. Count our blessings and spend the money on more worthwhile causes/needs.

These are adequate information and incentives currently.

Where this can be done at little or no cost, go for it. Remembering to think about our options is important. I have enjoyed the Ten Toes Walks program, but I have also seen how many Voters Pamphlets were in the recycling -- and the trash -- at a local post office this week. Getting people to care, notice, and read something is hard.

First pave and sidewalk the streets. Try to keep the cost of TriMet fares low to the point of subsidizing the fares to encourage people to use mass transit. Build more bike lanes after all roads are paved and sidewalks added. Again, government does not seem to get this --- pave the streets! No more gravel roads!

Most "solutions" that government prefers to impose have more to do with building monuments, bureaucracies, and expanding "turf". like choo choo trains that are enormous wastes of money and inconvenient for users. Projects beyond a certain size should be put to vote...the temptation is too much for bureaucrats to build monuments when someone else must pay the bill.

Most of those who are able to carpool, walk, bike already do so. Making public transportation more attractive may be the most successful strategy.

Not that I'm opposed to paying for various forms of promoting ride-sharing, etc., but let's spend the money first by fixing our roads, including residential roads, and establishing a dedicated revenue stream for keeping the roads in repair. Paved roads were a good 20th Century invention in Oregon; let's keep them paved in the 21st Century and put the potholes out of business. Then we can talk about more sophisticated "travel options."

People generally know about options. The investment needs to be in the infrastructure, not in marketing.

First, end the traffic calming program. Next, seriously consider things like Uber and challenge the established taxi companies.

You do not need more investment which is a euphemism for more spending to tell us where to walk and ride bikes. And government does not have to run ride sharing when there are companies eager to start doing so without using any public money.

I believe that promoting flexible work schedules and telecommuting are far more cost effective to achieve the same means.

People can find out how to use these options, the government does not need to spend money on promoting them.

These are things the public should use if it wants. It is not the governments job to expand their use!
A very small % of expenditures should be spent in this area (less than 1%).

All of these options have been around for years. People know about them already. I used to belong to the Tri-Met Carpool system for YEARS. A big waste. Never could get anyone going from my home area to my work area at times that were good for all parties.

Doesn't work now, won't work if you throw more money at it. Outsource it to Craigslist (although have them use a different domain!).

Effectiveness.

I think there are enough options that most people know about already. You won't get all people out of their vehicles entirely. That's a superficial goal & unrealistic. As people age, they will rely more on private transportation vs. public transportation. Infill development without driveways & or parking is ridiculous. It creates more opportunities for auto thefts, thefts from vehicles, & car prowls. No one should lose their garage for infill development & be left with nothing but an asphalt or concrete driveway to store their vehicle. This is a bad planning policy.

I think there is already plenty of info about options. Keep up the good work!

Incentives shouldn't be necessary if the program overall is designed appropriately.

It hasn't worked very well so far. Stop the social engineering. Remember that Portland is diverse. Metro's transportation policies are so upper-income white oriented. Bike mode share has stalled. The only reason even more people aren't driving is telecommuting.

No comment.

Personal electric vehicles will be dramatically smaller and reduce congestion. Services like Uber should be encouraged.

Programs like this have never worked and never will. We are Americans and independent. Good choices come from within, not from so done paying us.

Provide the options and public will know about them.

Raise the fuel tax.

The money should go to basic maintenance.

There is no reason to beleive that more dollars thrown at transportation will help. ODOT and county planners motto should be "Planning for yesterday, tomorrow."

An even greater waste of money.

Doesn't work now, won't work if you throw more money at it. Outsource it to Craigslist (although have them use a different domain!).

Effectiveness.

Fringe transit options should fund themselves.
How to make public transit not dependent on tax dollars.
I really don't think incentives work. Getting peers to talk about experiences and make it the "in" thing is more likely to work.

I think there is already plenty of info about options. Keep up the good work!

It would depend if the use of information and incentives have proven to be cost-effective.
No comment.

NO!!!! This does not work!!!! People have busy lives and it does not make sense to ride share, etc. The only thing that makes sense would be to allow cars onto a rail-car on Amtrak (like the ferry system in Washington, but by rail) to travel to places. Then I can take the train and have my car!

Raise the fuel tax.
Sort out the existing system first.
This includes too many options.

Yes or no not declared or zip code not provided
1 97004 Formation is great, but incentives?
2 97006 I don't think we need "more" investment in this.
3 97030 Again its responsibility.
4 97045 carsharing, carpooling -- these don't really work in today's society. We want to get there by ourselves - either drive, or bike or walk. Public transit is no longer considered safe if you watch the news. Good luck with all of those. I would like to see safer biking connectivity between towns.
5 97080 We have no money for this. Taxpayers and Businesses are over-taxed already. Have you really looked at how there is no real economic recovery to the middle-class?
6 97116 Rewards like zoo passes for people who consistently use transit, for example, people who buy monthly bus passes for a whole year. Free pedometers for everyone.
7 97123 A centralized website where one can state where start and finish points of one's commute with specific dates and times would allow others to find partners, rides, etc. Right now people look at different places online-- unify it!
8 97202 It's fine but it will not accomplish much, and it is requires actually having travel options! So one needs the transit, bikeways, and sidewalk network if this is going to make a contribution.
9 97202 The information is only helpful if the alternative infrastructures (i.e. bikeways, carpools) are comprehensive and readily accessible to the average person!
10 97204 Making single car occupancy less attractive would help.
11 97210 Increase safety for pedestrians, we have to dodge automobiles and bicycles.
12 97213 Return back to the car pool lanes again for car pools and motorcycles.
Charge for parking and charge tills on congested roadways, and use the resulting revenues to expand the availability of various non-SOV options.

I think this is less important than improving the safety of bike/pedestrian infrastructure/bike routes and having more frequent busses, but incentives could also be important. My employer has a biking incentive that, while I would bike to work anyhow, makes me bike more regularly b/c of the incentive and bike-friendly culture.

There should be more incentives for people to take public transit.

This is a tough question!! People should be concerned about the quality of life they experience. Adding more cars does not do that. Paying people to do the right thing is something I am not in favor of. Ride shares, car pooling, etc should be the way it is!!!! Sadly incentives may be necessary.

Low costs Low hanging fruit probably already plucked.

Replacing taxi service with uber doesn't qualify as an improvement, IMHO. Car sharing (car rentals) has its place, but would rather see more incentives for tri-met vs toward companies that "disrupt" heavily regulated car companies because they ignore said regulations that protect the public.

The problem with carpools is that I can never find someone going from somewhere near me and going to somewhere near where I am going. I have used some of the online services before, but have not found them useful. I also live on the outer edge of car sharing zones and often would need them while travelling outside the zone -- which defeats the purpose of something like Car-to-Go. If I could ride the bus, I would need the car share program.

I think the incentive needs to be self motivation. I don't think citizen's should be bribed to do what is right.

What kinds of incentives are being considered?
6. Do you support your community’s implementation of parking policies to make efficient use of land and parking spaces?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 6:

1. Zip Code
2. 666 Efficient use of parking and land are counter intuitive. There is no issue of parking unless you are referring to the BID.

3. 7089 Many of us avoid urban destinations just because of this.
4. 9730 Make commercial only zones for service type vehicles.
5. 97002 To an extent, but private lots should be utilized as much as possible, get the government out of it.
6. 97003 The area has so many new apartments being made with barely any parking for them. They need to have adequate parking spaces for each development.
7. 97003 Stop putting down black asphalt pavement as a driving/biking/walking surfaces, furthering the heat island problem in Oregon. Clear pavement binders are readily available and only need serve as the top lift. Businesses should be supplying their own parking spaces as a rule.
8. 97003 Make meters cheap and easy to maintain like they used to be (the old coin machines). Go back to the parking hours that were in place in the 1990's when people actually used to enjoy going downtown. Window stickers are just more litter to throw away. Parking hours and rates should ENCOURAGE people to go places, not discourage.

9. 97003 I don't want to see developers encouraged to build apartments and condominiums with no parking spaces. I don't think people's use of public transit should be mandated in this way.
10. 97003 I agree parking is essential and needed but if areas stop overdeveloping there will not be a shortage of parking or areas for transit to drop off.
11. 97003 Do a better job of educating the public that there is no such thing as, "free" parking. Remove underused asphalt parking lots for housing/retail purposes. Good "infill" potential in the suburbs.
12. 97004 While it is good to encourage transit, it is BAD that Portand doesn't have parking options for out-of-town visitors.
13. 97005 This is a tough one. Allowing development without dedicated parking seems like it is exacerbating the problem in older neighborhoods. Shared parking with business seems challenging as businesses may change but are then "stuck" with something they didn't negotiate. Park and rides do seem to be at capacity but that is probably very expensive for the return on investment over a reasonable time. Don't really have a good idea other than to price it at an amount that begins to manage it. However that hasn't seemed to be effective in other big cities.
14. 97005 The location, the demand, and the amount of space available.
The focus must be on more efficient use of existing spaces and not addition of more spaces. There should be an equal focus on reducing the need for parking by fostering alternative transportation and enacting policies to discourage personal automobile use in the city center.

Realistic assessments of how many drivers there are so that there is adequate parking for the neighborhood. Paying attention to sufficient business parking so residential neighborhoods have room to park.

Provide enough parking at Max stations to cover volume of riders.

More park-and-ride needed! Beaverton transit center please!

Less space for parking.

Free or more park and ride.

Discourage large surface lots. Build (pay) structures at MAX stations.

Build multi story parking garages.

Build garages.

Yes, lighten up on parking restrictions. We don't go downtown anymore because parking is such a pain and it is clear that cars are less and less welcome. Too bad for downtown, we spend our money in places that welcome us in our car.

With so many people driving compact cars, couldn't we make most parking spaces smaller, which would allow for some extra spaces (esp for mass transit). offer free parking for car pools and zero emission vehicles. shuttles for distant parking, to keep core areas car free.

There must be far more disabled parking made available, especially in downtown Portland, NW Portland, and the entire Lloyd Center area. Many disabled people I have known have had to spend 30 - 60 minutes driving endlessly around and around trying to find parking that will permit them to watch a ticketed performance, shop, go to a professional appointment, attend to banking/insurance matters, participate in a conference, eat at a restaurant, address governmental matters, or otherwise engage in necessary activities. There are no designated disabled parking areas, so it is quite easy to find oneself half a mile or further from where one is trying to go, just to find available parking. That's unsafe, unjust, and unreasonable for all who may be either temporarily or permanently disabled. It, especially, puts an enormous physical and financial strain on those who usually have the least of those resources to waste. Designated disabled parking needs to be created and enforced.

Sure ... get this constructed better so users can easily park their cars somewhere if they need to connect with public transportation. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income to implement better parking structures. Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.

Provide better parking options at max entry/exit points so people are more apt to use max.

No thoughts at this time.
Need more park and ride spots on west side (Beaverton). Milliken and Sunset Transit Centers fill up by 8 or 9 am on weekdays.

Make downtown Portland accessible to cars again with better on-street parking and changing the free hours back to where they were.

In particular, park and ride lots need more spaces. The sunset transit lot could squeeze in some more spaces by making most spaces smaller, for example. Perhaps giant cars should pay a fee for the extra space they take up--airlines and theatres are thinking of doing this with oversize patrons.

If we restrict certain areas for pedestrians only, we could build areas like the MAX parking structures where people would leave their cars and ride to the commercial centers in which they could have a car-free environment.

I'd hope this wouldn't be terribly expensive!

I live and work in Beaverton so this isn't super relevant to me on a daily basis.

Few transit centers can expand their parking--and more spaces are needed. Please consider re-striping so that more spaces for small cars exist--that would make at least a few extra spaces in each center. I think there are a few more spaces that could be gained by allowing a bit of parking where there are now no parking signs. A bigger fix is to improve bus service to transit centers so that fewer people ever get in their cars. I used to live on Leahy. The 60 ran from there to sunset transit, but stopped long before I needed to go to work. Too far for me to walk, but often, there were no parking spots at sunset transit. I was sometimes late to work because of this.

Cost. Maybe we should just have less parking to force people to use alternatives.

Communicate well and frequently with businesses.

Certainly existing parking resources should be used efficiently, but let's not be in a hurry to add parking. I'd rather see a park than a parking lot.

As long as it's fair and equitable and does not discriminate against those who need their cars and that there are reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

This is fine for downtown Portland. Make sure that you keep it in Portland. (Where I NEVER GO)!

The City of Portland has been reducing the amount of available parking in order to subsidize their parking garages. I detest having to pay to park; however, there should be a dis-incentive for parking for longer than a given period in a single spot.

The Beaverton Transit Center has no long term parking. How can it be a transit center if there is no parking? To use the airport (Red Line) MAX you have to park at Milliken Way and change from Blue Line to Red Line.

Sounds good, but if I'm staying for 3 hours and all the spots are designated for one hour that will be a big problem. Shared parking lots sounds appealing.
Priorities should be directed to the electrification of personal transportation options. EV's should given priority and a robust charging infrastructure with tax dollars assistance requires integration with any parking plan under consideration.

Portland should not allow the building of multifamily housing that does not have sufficient parking on-site. Parking policies should maximise space for business development and encourage mass transit and biking. More secure bike parking areas is needed most. More parking spaces so I can do park and ride on Max would help.

Metro and other regional transportation planners are currently underestimating future parking needs. Recent research has indicated that residents in housing with no or limited parking are not giving up their vehicles. How to provide for the greatest number of end users at the best cost.

Have a mix of longer-term spots. Those of us who go into town less frequently sometimes need more than the 1 hour allowed in many business areas. I like the Portland system of portable tags: I can buy the tag at one spot, drive to another and still use that tag until its time expires.

Focus on parking policies and build-up of infrastructure specifically for electric cars. EVSEs, rules for use, etc. Every Transit Center should have a park and ride lot. It's ridiculous to have central locations where commuters could be catching any form of transit to get pretty much anywhere in the metro area, but nowhere for those who need to get there by personal vehicle (due to lack of service/frequency to outlying areas, as mentioned previously) to park.

Effective use of parking is welcome. This need to be driven for efficient use of existing space and allocation of more parking space. Future development must include parking as part of the approval process. Do where it is needed.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

All of the above.

A fair way to have people have access without parking space and/or cost prohibiting it.

We need more parking. We also need parking that allows people to park for extended periods of time.

We have more than enough wasted space taken up by heat reflecting asphalt and parking lots. Park-and-ride is good, but no more land paved for lots that sit empty.

The most effective way to manage parking is to make it cost money.

Please stop allowing high-density residences to be constructed w/o adequate parking spaces.
One big beef: park & ride parking at many more transit stops (None at Beaverton TC? What’s up with that? Secure free parking there would go a long way to lure us onto the MAX--bussing rather than driving to the TC dramatically increases transit time into Portland). More parking garages incorporating the availability signage used at PDX. Better exit strategies for private garages to reduce idling when a major event lets out. Reduction of empty acres of parking lot (again, Beaverton...) in favor of smarter, more compact but still adequate parking and expanded greenspace.

Eliminating parking spaces has never reduced auto traffic. It just increases time spent looking for parking. Make parking easy to find and plentiful. And charge for it.

Better enforcement of handicapped spaces, park and ride and better meters.

Timed parking spaces - 15, 30, 45, 60 minute, etc. in heavy use areas. No parking meters or timed space away from heavy use areas.

This is a hot button issue for many. Knowing that, do not ignore it. Metro can be sunk politically for many years, and not having the trust of the population it is designed to serve (and trust levels are already low, low, low) can sabotage worthwhile efforts in areas besides the seemingly simple one of parking.

Provide more parking spaces and provide more time per parking episode.

Making parking more productive is important.

Affordability.

Parking facilities should be expensive so that commuters are encouraged to use public transportation.

More park and ride areas.

I would love to see more free and safe park and ride options.

Safe and secure bike parking for free.

Replace unused large parking areas such as Kmart parking lots with plants.

Must keep parking in mind when allowing multiple family dwellings, retail, schools, etc. to be built.

More park & ride lots for MAX. Some metered & designated areas are appropriate for special circumstances. But charging for all parking will discourage use of public trans.

Make it affordable.

High rise parking buildings are a great investment.

But doesn't parking stimulate car use?

Very complex issue. Good luck.

Use appropriate pricing and technology (e.g., Montreal's system for providing info on available spaces), but do not artificially restrict parking to force people into less effective means of transportation.

Should avoid excessive parking.

Realistic need.
Parking, like any form of public policy is just one of several options that should be available. It is unwise and uneconomic to penalize one particular mode in favor of others.

Parking is necessary for many and should remain affordable for those with no other viable options.

Parking is a mess in downtown Portland, I know a lot of business people who have moved out of the city core due to that alone. Quit wiping out parking spaces by putting bike racks in there or restaurant seats.

Make sure machines are in good working order and lines are clear in delineating spaces.

Like everything travel related here, especially in Portland parking is terrible and expensive. I for that reason alone rarely go downtown or areas where I have to find parking and pay for it. In my area there is no train, I am to far to walk and unable to bike that far. Buses are also subject to traffic and so if I am stuck in a car I only go where I can avoid being stuck in traffic and park in a business parking area.

I support only if it means more (not less) parking spaces per unit.

Government should NOT determine the minimum or maximum number of parking spaces required for a development. Government should also not dictate size and number of compact parking spaces. Let the property owner decide. However, metered parking as now exists in downtown Portland is a great idea. Shared parking should also be allowed and cities' zoning codes should be amended where necessary to easily allow shared parking. Transit park and ride should never be free. It should be metered so it pays for itself.

Evaluate neighborhoods where street parking is problematic. Don't allow construction of new multi-unit buildings without adequate parking in these areas. Consider funding new parking structures (underground would be great) through building taxes on new multi-unit permits.

All public parking should cost money.

We need parking structures in dense areas and get rid of parking on the street.

There is no such thing as "free" parking. The public pays for it, and it's actually quite expensive. Instead of wasting money by providing "free" parking, we should be encouraging other modes of transportation.

Park and rides near transit hubs.

Much of the suggested programming cannot be sustained by governments of smaller communities. Metro-level policies must be sensitive to this.

But have no hope that the community will look to its best interest and people will find a way to get around restrictions.

You probably need parking structures as on street parking is a nightmare and parking around, for example, Portland State is unrealistic, the fines are way too high and the whole thing makes the area one to be avoided.

So long as the policy pays for itself within existing tax revenue through parking meters, paid parking or utilizing efficiently existing funds then I think implementing this development would be a good idea.

Especially park and ride for transit.
Adequate parking for transit users.
You also need security at the park-and-ride or it won't be used. Too many break-ins. Now I understand they're building apartments without parking which seems illogical.
This is helpful for those of us on the edges of the UGB.
They should hurry up on this one and get spaces. Portland is already allowing lots of apartments with parking in residential areas. Is this really SMART?
Simply need MORE parking. There is already enough park-and-ride!
Shared parking between businesses, churches, etc.
secure parking for park and ride.
Public and private partnerships would be the most benefit.
Personal and rental / hire cars are not going away -- make more parking slots available rather than reducing parking spaces!

Parking is part of the transportation picture.
Maximize space available for parking and limiting congestion on arteries.
Making parking in Portland reasonably priced during the workday.
It is a qualified yes! Business models have to show ROI.
I think that police should ticket more folks who have disabled permits in their cars and who aren't disabled and doctors should get a slap on the wrist for issuing them. We don't use battery operated cars out here in the rural areas, so why do all of our stores have 6 dedicated spots for them? We can't park close to the door because there are SIX EMPTY dedicated battery car parking spot. Nice idea but how about have ONE or TWO. Most of us drive trucks in Clackamas County for instance so please don't mandate that we have these silly battery car parking spots. I think in terms of available parking, there is ample. Especially if you get rid of the battery car ones.

I love free parking, but I don't have a right to it and either do you. Get rid of free parking - especially for employees. Direct some of the revenue to increase transit options and frequency of service.
Don't raise the fee for parking. Community gets priority compared to visitors.
Creating parking that works but also encourages people to ride bikes or public transit.
But must also have a way to enforce parking rules.
Build underground parking beneath retail operations, freeing up acres of land used just for parking.
A major issue is that buildings and arena are being updated such as Providence Park with no parking. Apartments should only be built with appropriate parking.
Whenever you approve expansion or new buildings mandate that the company and builder/designer client or public parking.
Make sure that there is free parking for local residents, especially in low income areas.

Increase parking required on new multi family construction.

Adequate parking availability will reduce driving to find spaces thus reducing fuel waste.

Preserve and enforce convenient parking for disabled persons.

Parking is needed. The parking issue and alternative transportation go hand in hand. Other means can free up parking.

Very large parking areas with shuttles to nearby businesses.

This would be a low priority also.

Keep parking costs so that the average person can afford it! I'm from a rural area and "pay for parking" is a foreign concept to me! So make it work and use the fees in this program (turn them back to this program so that maintenance and security is available).

First, Downtown Portland needs to decided if it wants us suburban and rural shoppers. If it does NOT, then continue as the current implementation. If you want money from those of us who do not live downtown, make it easy and convenient to find parking (signs, entry and exit lanes from parking and parking structures, real-on-street parking (not most of the curb space taken by loading zones, drop-boxes, etc.). Otherwise, of course, we will continue to spend our money at suburban malls and on-line.

Everyone LOVES the parking at the airport where it shows how much and WHERE parking is available. Should be more of that!

Don't know.

Businesses should not get a dollar break for services - everyone pays the same.

Yes, I'm hesitant, only because I drive and like cheap (or free parking), but I admit the policy is rational and more importantly I'm familiar with some of the research behind it. I do have a specific request: I like much Portland maintains downtown a system of discounted public parking garages. Both on-street and garage fees are a bargain. Please keep this system and have such a system expand to other dense areas of Portland and city centers in the region. If I drive and know there's a "park once" garage I can go to that will always be cheaper than a private parking lot or garage, I will park there immediately. (Corollary: If an on-street space is cheaper than a garage per hour, I will circle and hope for a space. If you want to curb this behavior, in general I believe the price per hour needs to be the same for public garage and on-street spaces, but, keeping a daily price cap for garage spaces. Also, please have Metro twist the arms of the 'burbs to not require off-street parking and have stricter maximum parking caps -- the Metro 10% less than the common nationwide requirements (e.g. 2.7 per 1,000 sq feet of office instead of 3.0) -- from the 1990s is a good step but not nearly strong enough.

Um yes as long as this isn't planning code for raising the taxes on parking spaces, time of day 300% increases in fees, etc. Don't lie, I know that's what's going on here.
Tualatin is really restricted when it comes to parking availability, and I think it was short-sighted to leave out a parking garage at Nyberg Rivers shopping center. It could have been useful for so much more during off-hours.

The most important thing is to HAVE parking and that people can use this to get in and out of places via park and rides for transit or sufficient time allowed and at a manageable price for parking in all places to help spur support of business in small cities in the region as well as being able to truly enjoy and utilized downtown Portland.

Realize that residents in a suburb view what is convenient parking differently than if they are in downtown Portland. I'm not in favor of more gigantic parking lots in the burbs but planners need to acknowledge this different view as they plan for the future.

As long as parking and planning "guidelines" do not become hard and fast rules.... every community has different parking priorities - one rule/spacing does not fit all.

All of those options are important. Park and ride for transit is probably my priority IF transit was available at all hours. I love to travel in Europe; we always use the trains everywhere we go; have never rented a car there.

Type of neighborhood - commercial or residential. Make sure multifamily structures provide parking for their tenants.

The Region should use new technologies to assess parking availability and relay supply information to the driving public to reduce autos driving around in circles to find a place to park. Providing times, metered, shared parking or designated parking for certain uses are needed to help grow our economy in business districts. Park and rides are needed to encourage transit. Security is a big issue for park and rides as well as parking lots and on street parking.

Proceed with this option one step at a time.

Portland State parking is a nightmare. There could be an offcampus parking lot with van service to address this problem.

People get discouraged due to poor management and foresight for parking and parking resources.

Parking needs to be considered in junction with other transit policy vs. after the fact.

Park and Ride areas are always over-used in my experience, and it impacted my use of transit.

Make parking space construction MANDITORY when adding residential housing units.

Make no parking zones more visible. I have gotten a ticket because the sign was blocked by a truck.

Make it easy and clear. Do in high use areas.

Just remember, not everyone drives a Fiat 500 or Mini. Make sure that the spaces are adequate. Remember, this is the Northwest. A lot of drive SUVs.
Increase parking in areas you desire more commerce. The downtown areas are a huge deterrent to those wishing to conduct business due to horrendous parking fees and limited use.

I would like to see technology link to smart phones that can tell drivers WHERE there are available parking spaces.

I suspect your underlying objective is to reduce the number of parking spaces. **WRONG!** Reducing parking in a business area punishes business. That may not bother you government employees. **ADD Parking!!!!** Add park and ride. This will increase use of public transit. The use of connecting buses to connect to rail is futile and burns precious hours.

Create hubs of parking for use of transit. Fairness-some will hog parking spots.

Allow more room for parking so I don't have to drive around forever to find a place to park downtown.

We need more park and rides and garages.

Provide efficient mass transit to areas and then charge for parking cars to those places.

Parking lot off 4th Ave/I-405 near PSU closed on the weekend all the students are moving in to campus? really? **Bad planning.** The whole community should coordinate events...even "small" ones to be sure the appropriate parking is available. Amount of time someone is expected to stay in the area. Where the alternatives are? Perhaps even "post" where alternatives are..."if planning to stay longer try..." and list the three to four closest facilities. Those facilities can "pay" to be listed, but either way, there is no loss of income because all feel the city is more friendly, visit more often, use different parking because not so frustrated. Coordinated efforts.

No need for a bunch of money-wasting studies, we need more parking in the Greater Portland area. All of the above suggestions (timed, metered, specific-use, no restrictions, and free) are good. Park-and-ride is good, too.

Need to supply on site parking to handle multi-family residential development in Portland and the Region. Examples of multi-family residential development in SE Portland on Division Street are not the right way to go if you want to have safe, reliable, transit, bike, pedestrian, and vehicle transportation.

More local control of implementation. Local decision makers understand the specific issues of a community better.

Increase parking around transit stops.

Get vehicles off the streets by centralizing parking for neighborhood centers so streets no longer bisect them.

Build parking garages up not out.

Allow PCC Cascade to build a parking structure as the campus expands westward.

Use shared parking between businesses when possible.

stop downsizing parking spaces.

Plan for adequate parking as new construction occurs.
Consider whether integrating some peer to peer processes into the public transportation mix might strengthen infrastructure.

As much parking as possible should be free.

Also make new apartments have built in parking, not on street.

Use technology to help people find parking. Aggregate the available parking lots into some kind of website PORTLAND PARKING, so that when people need to be somewhere (particularly downtown), they can find a parking lot or structure without driving around and around. Try searching for SmartPark .. instead of a map of locations you get a list of locations. GET VISUAL with search results please.

Smartphone apps to locate open parking .. locate nearest parking structure.

Require parking in all residential units. This no parking apartment buildings is like no openings in the bottoms of skirts or pants. Useless. Make all parking multiple levels. Waste of money and space, when overhead is not used.

Require all new domiciles, whether single-family or multi-family, to include sufficient parking for the number of adults who will live in the new structure. It is downright silly to build an apartment which will house 20 - 40 adults, who likely all have cars, and provide no parking for them. Subterranean parking lots should be put in for all of these projects if there is not sufficient space on the property for parking.

Reduce the waste of space held exclusively for handicap parking. For example, nearly 1/5 of patient/visitor parking spaces near hospitals is virtually unused handicap spaces. Secondly, I see cars displaying handicap tags, parking in handicap spaces in retail parking lots every day and the only occupant was the driver who is totally free of physical handicaps.

Parking needs to be economical, easy to use and safe.

Parking downtown in particular is very costly and often inconvenient. While I would love to see everyone take transit, that isn't always an option. Some of us need our cars or the transit options don't work for us anymore.

More loading zones downtown!

Making sure that fees are fair area wide and not burdensome to the community at large.

If housing, and apartments are built the plan must include adequate off street parking.

I like the light system at PDX which lets me know if there is parking available, and if so where, in a particular level and aisle. This technology should be implemented for all parking garages and large lots. REQUIRE APARTMENT AND CONDO UNITS TO BUILD PARKING GARAGES OR UNDERGROUND PARKING FOR THEIR TENANTS! It is foolish that large apartment complexes are being built for hundreds of tenants but there is no parking for them. Businesses are going to be hurt by this policy and will move out, making those neighborhoods less desirable.

How much parking might be needed and a better way to police handicap parking.
Generate revenue by requiring businesses to purchase parking spaces. On the other hand, reward businesses that discourage parking with incentives for use of alternative transportation. However those systems must be efficient and in place. Strongly discourage public transportation on main streets. Look at the Champs-Elysees or Italy. We need more pedestrian only streets and markets. Encourage freight deliveries prior to 6am. Look to the infrastructures in place in European large cities. They get the people moving and encourage economic development within the neighborhoods!

For the downtown core, more attention needs to be given to the people who have to drive there in connection with work. Now a lot of spaces are limited to cater to shoppers. Shoppers are better able to get rides or use public transit for short visits.

Can the cost for parking be shared by all, even non-users?

Again, it depends on the implementation. Market-based parking fees (e.g., based on the time of day) seems to be the fairest to me.

Recognize that everyone will need an all season method of transportation, and that travel will frequently move outside the metro area. Consequently most everyone will need access to a car, and many will choose to own one. Parking requirements for apartment blocks need to reflect this, even in areas close to mass transit.

Force businesses to internalize the cost of their vehicle-borne employees and customers.

Find the middle ground between urban sprawl parking and north Portland's no parking make sure there are other options to offset reduced parking.

All MAX stops should have park and ride areas--not just the outer ones. New housing should require parking for all inhabitants. Even those who use public transit or walk have a car that they use some times and need a place to park it!

Would like to see real-time GPS location of available parking spaces in high-use areas and in peak times. This would save on aimless driving, waste of gas, and reduce pollution.

Why not use the program that is used in SFO to show where there are vacant spots to park. also..no virgin land should be used for parking lots..unless there is more green ...trees in them.

We need more parking at Carver Park.

No more restrictions on metered parking. Less metered times making it affordable for people to come and park in downtown.

More car sharing.

Consider incentives companies that allow staggered shifts for better traffic flow and more parking flexibility.

Developers need to provide on-site, off-street parking.
Reduce the need for parking by building smart-planned communities where most goods and services are within walking/biking distance. Options for transporting goods by bus. Shared parking is a must.

A lot more light rail parking would help! Look at the Sunset transit station, Parking is a joke!

Pervious parking surfaces.

Stop building apartments that lack parking spaces.

Simply provide sufficient parking - free.

Probably starting with an inventory and needs assessments is best and then decide which solutions to implements based on your findings.

More convenient parking at Trimet stations.

Maybe more businesses could have their parking lots with designated park and ride spots on the outer edges of their lots which also tend to be close to the sidewalks and the bus stops.

Make sure that new housing developments have sufficient off-street parking, as well as for businesses for their employees.

Parking on street should be for business customers, or residential visitors.

Just make parking plentiful, convenient and free.

If you want people to use transit, then parking needs to be very inexpensive or free for that purpose. Also people who need to use a vehicle to get their bicycle to a point where they can ride (or possibly walk).

Yes and No I support this. You put a lot into the description. Yes, I support more park and ride options and sufficient parking for those that already exist. I don't necessarily think we need to spend a huge amount of time/money on other parking issues.

The current policy of less than one vehicle space per housing unit is not tenable. What about roommates living together?

Neighborhoods and residents need to be given priority. Others should have time limits or be encouraged for carpool and electric, etc.

Max and buses are not the best way for some. As long as we have cars, we should provide plenty of parking - no more apartments/condos with inadequate parking. The Pearl is a nightmare. If there's not a way to provide parking, then don't build the buildings.

Limit handicap-access permits. They are being abused. They should exist, but the proof of disability needs to be adjudicated.

Find a way to encourage businesses with large parking lots to designate a portion of their property for public parking.

Don't build more buildings, especially multi-unit dwellings without at least one parking space per dwelling unit.

Continue to raise parking rates and places within a few hundred meters of a MAX stop. Metering Washington Park and the zoo was brilliant!
concerned about taking the same approach for all portions of the region. Need to recognize the impact parking policies may have on businesses in lower performing market areas.

Yes! However, as a Timbers fan, I can say that a lack of available parking for games acts as a disincentive for driving (and, conversely, creates an incentive for taking public transit). If parking is scarce, public transit needs to be widely available/accessible and convenient.

Use vs value. Incentives to use park/ride options. More spaces in highly traveled areas where other public transport is not easily accessible.

There should be more park and ride at MAX stations. The Sunset station fills up every week day by about 8:30 a.m. yet spaces were taken away for bike parking which is underutilized. Zoo parking should be able to be used for the MAX during the winter months when the lots at the zoo are 3/4ths empty.

There needs to be a variety of parking spaces available at park and rides. There needs to be lots of open spaces with no restrictions. If there are too many restricted spots people may opt to drive instead of riding the MAX. The spaces at some park and rides are very small and not labeled compact. I refuse to park at Sunset transit station because the spots are very narrow. I understand trying to squeeze in as many spaces as possible, but not to the point where it is very difficult to get in and out of your vehicle. I have a narrow vehicle.

Require businesses to re-stripe their parking lots so that 75% of their parking spaces are for small cars or hybrids only.

Population density and close proximity to shopping and businesses.

Planning and zoning should help offices churches and entertainment venues to share parking opportunities.

More park and rides. Fewer all-day parking options in areas easy to get to by public transit and more short term parking.

Make sure there is parking available for cars don't end up circling an area constantly looking for parking......Also watch how much you are charging or it will discourage people from patronizing business areas.

Increase park and ride supply near freeway bottlenecks (e.g. Sunset TC). Active parking management through products like Streetline are a good idea. Promote car sharing and uber to reduce demand for parking.

I understand that Insurance and liablility issues are reasons for businessiness to close their parking to NON-customers, during NON-business hours. Something should be done to make all parking OPEN to the public durring off hours.

I support this policy, but it should include allowing more land to be available for parks and green spaces, not just for other development.

Give priority to park-and-ride and to loading zones for car pools. People who want to drive their own cars should have to walk farther.
For some communities a starting place to implement some kind of policy.

As long as parking in employment areas is free people are less likely to find other options. We need to aggressively manage parking in these areas.

Raise parking fees and put the money toward helping people kick the automobile habit. More park-and-ride spaces -- transit stations are not always that close to residences, and people won't walk great distances to transit stations, especially in bad weather.

Try not to charge any more for downtown parking than you already do.

Shared parking between businesses would be great. Many large businesses currently have an over abundance of parking, I would assume there is a more efficient use of the land for all parties involved (businesses, landowners, and the general public). I am very supportive of the idea of increased park and ride capacity, but I think it just transfers a parking problem from one area to another. As long as the park and ride system can show reduction in miles being drive or a reduction in congestion I am not sure of their true value. Also an increase in neighborhood parking permits would be nice. No major fee per year or month, but enough to encourage people to think about the use neighborhood street parking as a public good. This would also, hopefully, reduce that number of people visiting the neighborhood in private vehicles and encourage the use of active or mass transit.

Parking should be stacked. Flat lots just take up space.

BART in SF Bay Area is an example of how NOT to do it. Many of the stations have very inadequate parking that make it impossible to commute to work via BART. Also, for a variety of reasons frequently the bathrooms or escalators aren't working which presents a problem for many people so they still drive.

Utilizing vacant land and county abandoned properties for the efficient use of parking and transit uses.

The true cost of parking should be calculated and passed on to users. Tax money should not support parking.

Suburban parking lots should have multi-level garages rather than surface parking in order to meet the needs of commuters. The central city cannot accommodate too many more vehicle commuters, so parking in close-in suburban park and rides have to be rebuilt to meet the growing demand.

See previous comment.

Same as with cars, this should be the lowest priority.

Raise cost of parking and make it more affordable to take public transit by subsidizing the latter, giving free transit passes to lower income workers. (Like free passes to students.) As long as parking is affordable, people will drive.

Public land (including rights of way aka streets) shouldn't be used to provide free storage for private cars. Public paid parking makes sense if the private sector isn't providing enough. Where private paid parking is used policy should ensure that there is a competitive market (i.e., choice and price competition).

Policies to discourage use of individual motor vehicles in the downtown core altogether.
Parking, especially surface parking, is a blight. On street parking is a hazard, and there's no reason it should be free of charge anywhere in the city. It seems like charging market rate for parking could generate much-needed revenue and reduce the amount of auto traffic. I think the most important thing to consider is that the public needs to be reeducated about the value of 'free' parking. There's no reason the rest of us should be subsidizing private motorists.

Parking for turnover and long-term are different, and should be thought of separately. Have business responsible for all-day parking.

More sharing of parking. Careful look at handicapped spaces and where they are actually used and needed. Easier system of paying for parking.

Maybe more awareness that Park-n-Rides exist (seems like drivers from Beaverton/Hillsboro area drive all the way downtown when they only need to drive to Sunset Transit and take the MAX into town).

Make parking expensive during work hours; make it free at play times (i.e., Sat., Sun.).

Laudable goal, but not high priority.

It's self evident. Why not?

I think neighborhoods and business communities should have some input and control over the parking policies in their area and have the ability to make changes when needed.

Good move stopping the all day parking for people with handicap tags but why should anyone have free parking? If they can afford a car, they can afford to pay to park; having designated spots is enough of a subsidy.

Given that we live in a world of limited resources, a lot of attention shouldn't be spent on this. But where it can reduce cruising / looking for parking spaces, it can help reduce congestion and alleviate traffic. Cost should also be considered here - raise the gas tax to pay for these improvements.

Getting feedback from all stakeholders continually. We are doing a poor job of enforcing and fine-tuning the policies we have, so should fix that before new developments & policies. For example, the parking zone policies in my near-downtown neighborhood are not working well for the homeowners, have generated distrust over the long haul, and are grievously abused by residents & visitors. Enforcement and feedback loop.

Folks who drive have to park.

Fixing the "handicap" parking downtown was a step in the right direction. Possibly more park-and-rides for Max in the suburbs. I think they fill up sometimes. Also electronic signs at the parking structures to let people know how many open spaces there are.

Do everything to discourage driving and parking in downtown! Let people use the new improved efficient public transportation!

Add free parking at max and bus stops.
Accessibility including socioeconomic.

Yes. make sure regulations aren't overly complicated (I've lived in LA where there were 4 different signs for a single space), and avoid residential permit parking.

Yes, part of the get people on their feet plan requires making driving costs more transparent--so making people pay those costs up front will help to tip people in favor of more active modes.

We have way too much space devoted to parking cars now. Look at ways to encourage/require shared parking and enable markets for private parking spaces to develop (e.g., allow apartments buildings without new parking if they lease a few existing spaces at a nearby commercial establishment that does not use them all most of the time). Evaluate using variable parking meter rates based on time of day/location/capacity. Reduce drastically the parking allowed/required at shopping centers, etc... especially in suburbs. Tax surface parking lots a lot.

Variable rate parking that increases in price in response to demand.

Totally unrealistic to allow housing development without providing parking. Crowded Street parking is ruining neighborhood livability. Boo!

This is certainly an area for improvement. Perhaps modern technology can make this more efficient. Reserving a parking spot via the internet?

This could help encourage people to take alternative means of transportation

These revisions need to be made simultaneously with improvements in public transit. Neighborhood parking permits, especially in rapidly developing districts, will help solve many of the bad-neighbor and NIMBY problems hitting Division, Hawthorne, Williams etc.

The tricky thing here is people might disagree as to what "efficient use of parking" means. Some people might say lots of free & convenient parking is efficient. Others might say its more efficient to make parking less convenient to encourage people to use transit. At grocery stores, big box stores, and most malls, parking is plentiful and free, so many people are used to that. You need to do a better job explaining why that is not efficient.

The parking needs of retailer customers in the downtown core should receive high priority.

Take the needs of the neighborhood into account first.

Since you are allowing folks to build apartment complex's without any consideration for parking, I didn't realize that we had a parking policy.

Rights of property owners to park on street in front of their houses.

Restrict parking requirements for all large apartment complexes and commercial areas regionwide - suburbs, too. We have way to much land devoted to parking cars.
Requiring developers to have basement, or rooftop parking would be a major benefit to residents in popular neighborhoods like Richmond. Currently, people are taking up all residential parking spots in a 3 block radius of SE 34th & Division on many weeknights, and most weekends.

Reduce the need for parking.

Recognize that the region's residents need cars.

Quit allowing developers to build without appropriate parking.

Public parking is just that-- public. We shouldn't waste this resource for free.

Please find a better way to balance development with parking needs. I'm optimistic that the new developments on SE Division will lead to a lot of walking traffic, but I'm quite worried about competition for parking and unnecessary "cruising" of the surrounding neighborhoods for limited parking. I'm astounded the city didn't require underground parking for those new live/work spaces in that area that will no doubt generate millions in profits over the next decades to their owners.

People should not influence their leaders to usurp public parking as private. There is no guarantee that your house has a vacant spot in front of it. That's why it's called PUBLIC parking. Also, this is a terrible metric often mistaken as "livability."

Paying for parking is the NUMBER 1 reason people use transit instead of driving, so it's about time employers and all cities in the region start managing and charging for parking.

Parking should be demand regulated in shopping areas. Neighborhood parking permits will go a long way to easing issues with car-free development.

Parking is like a quarter of our land, and is a huge source of potential revenue. Parking spaces belong to all of us, but are only used by drivers - free this space up for non-drivers to use, or use the revenue to promote sustainable active transit options.

Parking around periphery of urban centers with inner transportation by bike, walking or public transit.

On-street parking (for instance, on extremely dangerous SE Milwaukie Ave) should be eliminated and bike lanes created so that bikes can move through the area efficiently and safely. It is not helpful to use the designated bike friendly street (17th) because it does not go all the way through. Bikes have to detour and detour and detour all over the city because of on-street parking and traffic-dominant streets. It is still WAY TOO DANGEROUS to bike in Portland.

Oh, go ahead and try it. I'd rather see us squash half the automobiles, but go ahead.

No single use parking lots. No flat parking lots (multi-use buildings are good, buried parking lots with parks or public spaces on top.) But not more parking. More work on making parking unnecessary, by making the city denser, and more walkable and rideable.

No idea.
No big flat parking lots. Parking should be in multi-use multi-story buildings, if there's parking. Businesses should be required to share parking as much as possible. Less parking is better. Park and Rides to get people onto MAX lines and transit. If we can make the core of the city as car free as possible we will have succeeded.

Need to have new multi family units have onsite parking to keep neighborhood parking for homeowners in front of their property.

More paid parking, and higher parking prices in Portland (the cheapest hourly parking of any major west coast city).

Making sure there is adequate and/or zoned permit parking for residents in neighborhoods that are rapidly increasing in density - I don't want to have to walk several blocks to my house in Sellwood b/c I can no longer find street parking in front of my own house b/c so many apartment buildings are going up with no parking.

Make sure parking is available and not hogged by people parking all day.

Make parking more expensive to discourage the practice.

Make parking expensive where it is in high demand.

Make parking expensive and difficult, as long as there are "park and ride" lots near handy mass transit, so that people have realistic options.

Lower priority than safety and expanding biking and walking.

Keep it simple. No blizzard of signs and times. Just places you can park for free, places you pay to park, and places you can't park.

It's time we stopped giving away the precious commodity that is parking. We need to charge for car parking region-wide, and use parking management as a way to help get more people onto transit, their bikes, and into their walking shoes. We should stop putting more parking in, unless it's the kind of parking that bikes and people's bums can use. A climate smart & multi-modal transportation system needs multi-modal parking, too.

In the long run, we need to get away from free parking on the public right of ways. There is definitely a dollars and cents cost to our society for building and maintaining the public right of way. There is also a lost opportunity cost to us for the land being used for parking private vehicles. Just because we have allowed it to happen over the last few decades does not mean it is right. Please work towards getting rid of all free storage of private vehicles on public property.

In some cases due to high density infill with no parking required, it's a little late for this.

Implement alternative transportation parking, preferred parking for carpool and biking. park and ride would be great for commuters. Gets people off the road in high density slow moving traffic areas. Spike strips in parking lots would be great too!

Impact on neighborhoods: require new apartment buildings to have parking under the building. Make parking more efficient in core business areas so street parking can be converted to bike lanes.

Impact and low-income and moderate-income families.
I'm all for using land more efficiently.

I would love to see permit systems in close in SE and NE similar to what is in place in NW Portland. I would like implementation to focus on more efficient use of parking spaces, not the addition of parking spaces.

I support this on a case by case basis. I advocate for a moderate / middle of the road approach to most issues and topics, such as parking. For new housing projects, for example, I like to find a balance between existing neighborhood residents that often want copious amounts of parking, and developers, that want to save money by using on street parking only.

I support an organized approach to managing parking, but again the information here is not sufficient to know what you're really talking about. Why would "more land be available for development," for example - wouldn't community consultation mean that communities could decide whether they wanted more development or not?

I believe that all businesses in specific areas should be required to allow after hours parking in their park in their parking lots. I often see under utilized spaces with signs threatening to have a car impounded if used. What a waste.

Help ensure parking is available to those who work and live in a given area, not park-and-ride/park-and-walk.

Have people park outside of downtown.

Free parking is not free. Somebody pays. The driver should.

Focus on park & rides. Allow for people to park long term in a park & ride if they are traveling via mass transit to the airport.

Expand more dense housing options without parking.

Every bit of public right of way that is used for parking and storage of personal vehicles should be metered or permitted. There should be no free parking and no one, including those on neighborhood streets, should be able to use the public right of way for the storage of their personal vehicle. The fees can be through meters or permits or annual parking stickers or whatever, and it can be a very minimal amount of money. We need to stop thinking that the public right of way is "free" because it isn't.

Even while we encourage less car use we need to supply parking in new developments (condos, apartments, etc) or our streets will be clogged with parked cars and those looking for spaces. Also we need more park and ride lots for MAX etc.

Emphasis should be on making efficient use of current parking resources, not expanding areas designated for parking.

ELIMINATE STREET PARKING. make designated bike valets & charge a high hourly price to park a car on the OUTSIDE of the core area. Go visit some of the European cities to learn how to manage cars. An added benefit of walking is that people will lose weight.

Do not make parking harder until improvements in transit are made.
Cost and equity. This is a low priority strategy. We should just invest as much as necessary to make the most of any parking we do have with an eye to projects that will serve lower income residents.

City of Portland needs to understand that most apartment occupants will have a car even if on a bus route. Not all people work downtown and will not spend the time to commute if they have to transfer which includes waiting. Also if the person takes the bus, then the car just stays on the street. Also inner city neighborhood houses do not have driveways (about 1/2) and that needs to be taken into consideration when allowing apartments to be built w/o parking. Also if I had to pay to park in certain city shopping areas ... I would just go to the mall. I do not shop on Sundays downtown now due to the parking meters.

But we need to let people know there are ways of getting to where they're going without the car. Put signs on parking garages and along streets with transit information. The middle class is just going to have to get "on the bus."

Better enforcement of parking zones to eliminate park and walkers.

As long as we have cars we need parking. Phase out cars by making mass transit cheaper and better -- not by punishing drivers.

Are we talking about car or bike parking? I'd like to see more bike parking available in all major retail areas like Division, Hawthorne, and Belmont.

Also, reduce the quantity of parking where supply exceeds demand.

All neighborhood commercial districts should have parking meters. Revenue should go towards transportation improvements and services in the local area.

Again, more resources should go to public transit than parking.

Again, although effective parking management is important, this should not be as heavily funded as the first four strategies covered in this survey.

Access for disabled.

Free parking is a powerful disincentive to making good choices about travel mode, development, etc.

We should have more metered parking to generate revenue for other transportation projects and repairs/ maintenance.

The region has an abundance of parking. Pricing parking and using parking management begins to show the true price of the automobile. This needs to be done if we want to truly prioritize and create a multimodal transportation system in the region.

The Pearl is a nightmare to find parking if you commute into work there. And the parking meter maid is a b*tch.
Parking is VASTLY underpriced in Portland. Metering should be expanded to include all of the major business districts: Hawthorne, Alberta etc. I would even (as someone who parks their auto in the street) support a yearly permit fee for most inner Portland neighborhoods. Parking is a huge subsidy to auto use and should be priced accordingly.

Park and Rides are demonstrably effective ways of reaching better transport goals. Just look at how hard it can be to find a parking place at these. They work. It will be a lot cheaper to expand existing P'n'R's (even building parking garages on their sites) than just about any other single action. More P'n'R's properly located will do more good than anything else. Meanwhile, I oppose any funding for increasing other parking in congested areas.

OK

Not allowing land to be solely used for parking lots -- every parking lot should be dual purpose instead of wasting valuable space to house cars. That dual purpose could be shops and offices, but it could also be green space/green roof/solar panels, community space, possibly even housing.

Incentives for owning less/no cars.

In the higher density inner urban areas, it will be important to provide on-street parking to neighborhood residents. Also need to question the land use policy of increasing density with multi-family buildings with no provision for resident parking. Decentralize development (commercial and residential) so parking demand is spread out within the city and county boundaries, creating pockets of employment in proximity to neighborhoods.

I travel to the central city for events like the Symphony and Soccer. Often when several events occur at the same time parking is difficult. Is there a way to make this better by using more parking?

Ensure parking is paying for itself/ remove subsidies on parking.

Enhanced priority for handicapped.

As long as it city wide. Not everyone lives works plays shops in inner Portland.

Spend more $'s on park-and-ride.

Free parking just encourages people to drive.

Do whatever is necessary NOT to increase parking spaces!

Again, I'm in favor if this doesn't result in increased property or other taxes.

Work toward a future of automated people moving systems that reduce the need of individuals to park in high density area. Return to a systems where businesses deliver goods and purchases [my childhood experiences where Meier and Franks and other stores provided same day delivery services even for small items].

We need to end public subsidy of parking private vehicles and charge for all use of streets for parking.

There should be no free parking.
Put a price on every curb-side parking opportunity to reduce the privatization of on-street (curb-side) parking.

Parking should be MORE expensive so people will use, bikes, MAX and busses.

Parking policies are not cohesive and vary from place to place.

Parking demand vs. parking availability. Make it clear whether or not parking is allowed and under what conditions.

More parking for bikes and other vehicles like Segways too--not just cars. Disincentivizing free employee parking as a perk--even in suburbia.

Make money off of public parking areas/streets, shouldn’t be free.

I only support it if it entails charging more for parking. End the free parking.

Expand metering and apply Donald Shupe’s pricing strategies to get cars into structure.

Eliminate all free parking. Add residential zone permits. All meters should be timed so that they are more expensive during peak hours.

But I don’t agree with the current policy of building housing anywhere, including in the downtown central city, without parking. Even if people use their cars only a couple times a week, they still own one. The language should be changed from parking to car storage. Mothers with children will own a car even if the walk or streetcar most of the time.

yes, maximize the revenue stream by fee-based personal vehicle storage on public roadways.

Yes, conditionally. It would always be better to promote non-auto means of transit. If shared parking and park-and-ride help us achieve that larger goal, ok.

Use parking as revenue stream as well as way to incentivize low-car living; parking should be connected to affordable housing production; downtown parking lots should be dismantled and/or heavily taxed; TriMet should raise revenue from park-and-ride users.

Unpriced parking is a huge implicit subsidy to driving. Eliminating unpriced parking in the Portland area could do more than any of these other strategies to decrease greenhouse gas emissions.

There is no "free parking." Businesses act like the on-street parking is "theirs" and scream bloody murder when anyone suggests using the space for actual transportation. We taxpayers are footing the bill for on-street parking. Perhaps more paid parking will help to offset transportation funding shortages.

Reexamine car filing system to maximize vehicle parking density.

Reduce long-term parking in town centers. use variable-rate smart metering. eliminate parking requirements for development along or near transit corridors. tax surface parking lots.

Private developers and property owners should pay for parking, not the public.

People shouldn’t be allowed to park on public property for free. I’d much rather see the space used as a park. There should be a fee for all street parking 24/7. Think of all the potholes we could fix with this money!
Parking structures as needed.

Parking rules are already too complex and too many areas are metered, effectively driving business away from critical areas. The decision to meter parking in Washington Park is simply ludicrous.

Parking needs to stop being free. If it is no longer free to store multiple cars in the public right of way, a lot of revenue will be produced, and space will be freed up for more important transit/active transportation projects.

Parking is way too cheap on streets.

Overbearing parking requirements are remnants of a bygone era. Parking requirements stifle development that makes our region more dense and ultimately more efficient and more affordable. Stop caving in to entrenched xenophobic interests in wealthy neighborhoods that complain about the "difficulty" of parking in Portland when in fact it’s one of the easiest large cities in the country to find a parking space in.

Not building so many condos/apartments. And not building them without recognizing there will be way more new cars and people than suggested.

Multilevel parking structures, esp at light rail sites.

Look at examples in Europe and Asia.

Increased density on corridors such as SE Division in the inner SE is allowed without the addition of parking, as it is assumed new residents will use public transportation. This is not happening, so either a provision for parking needs to be incorporated into these developments OR public transit needs to be highly incentivized (i.e., free).

I think we need to consider metering a lot more of the parking in the city.

I support this, but only in the sense that we need to be thinking about LESS parking, especially in the downtown core.

I support this in certain areas. Part of the reason there is no parking in SE and NE is because the people who live in all of these new buildings, do not have parking with their units so they are parking on the street where business customers could be parking. Also the people who work in the businesses are driving into town from outlying areas because they cannot afford to live in town anymore. What’s wrong with building a couple of centrally located parking garages in the outer boroughs where the parking is 25 cents an hour with no lease spaces except maybe on the very top level?

I support restricting parking, limiting times and charging more for on street parking. I do not support spending money to make parking more accessible.

I live in a part of town that seems to be developing with no oversight of parking needs. Truth is---people (even bikers and transit users) have cars they need to park. And consider the needs for parking spots for those coming to eat and shop in this area.
Have more 'pay to park' areas within business districts! And I support having a fee for parking on the streets vs a general street maintenance fee that we all have to pay for.

For park and rides, consider bicycle access before construction.

Fine with demand-sensitive metering and expanding metered areas.

Efficient use is a key phrase. Again, the more cars off the streets, the less problems with parking. The more car shares, the less problems with parking.

Demand parking be provided by apartment builders for their tenants.

By all means manage parking, do not designate spaces for certain uses, don't make the system anymore difficult than it already is. Parking limits, meters are all good. Stop assuming everyone in PDX is going to ride a bike and take transit, you are creating a revolt in the SE, require a reasonable amount of parking to maintain livability, most people own cars, plan for it. We are not Manhattan, nor do I think anyone here wants to be Manhattan. I frequent Division and Hawthorne less, because when I go I need to take transit, now I head to West Moreland and Sellwood where I can park.

As noted before, assess tolls on everyone entering a congested area. REQUIRE businesses AND BUILDERS to create underground parking when feasible, and above-ground multi-level parking when not feasible. STOP THE INSANITY OF ALLOWING BUILDERS TO BUILD WITHOUT ANY PARKING IN OUR RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS!! Like the Pearl Dist., it's ridiculous to suggest that apartment builders, business builders, etc., need an 'incentive' to build in this city! That couldn't be a bigger pile of shit!! Absolute nonsense. Builders will build without incentives. Don't give our city away (tho with waterfront, Pearl dist., and other big business giveaways -- corporate welfare programs -- that continue to be the norm, it's probably too late. You've stolen from the poor and given to the rich, business as usual).

As long as small businesses and residents are taxed.

Address big box/mall surface parking that is "free" everywhere but downtown.

Accessibility and safety.

Why build apartments w/o adequate parking? If you want cars off the street then give people a place to park. You will never eliminate a certain percentage of car users. Make it easier to park and walk or park near transit to ride.

The use of reduced parking options, and higher-priced parking options, should be studied as a means of favoring more environmentally and socially means of transportation.

Safety, cost.

New buildings without parking are a good thing, and we should encourage them.

It would be good to establish a link between transit service improvements and efforts to manage parking.
I live in the Pearl and watch employees consistently park in front of the place of work and buy time needed again and again. The problem of moving folks further out to park and then use public transport to get to work needs to be better addressed.

I live by 21st and NW Everett and am very excited to have more parking. I ride the bus or telecommute almost all the time but when I do need to drive somewhere it is hard to find parking when I get back especially when there are Timber’s games and if I have packages it is really hard!

Heavy increase in bike parking, not just car parking.

Fairness. I should not have to pay to park in my own neighborhood because a soccer stadium opened up 4 blocks away. And if I have to pay $60 a year, why don't the people who are driving in from Beaverton and Gresham have to pay to park in front of their own houses? Penalizing the residents is not a good solution, or a fair one.

Dynamic pricing at market prices for public parking.

Do you want to make driving somewhere more painful than taking public trans? Or do you want to attract people to shop and find free/plentiful parking. The malls have chosen the 2nd.

Be careful of current trend to build apartment buildings without adequate parking for residents or visitors on the expectation that will force the use of mass transit, walking, or bicycles when instead it may contribute to congestion and pollution as cars circle looking for parking. Develop realistic disabled parking policies that address the reality that disabled as not just those who are mobile in wheelchairs but more critically those who are unable to walk the distances to parking kiosks and back to vehicles before moving on to destinations.

Yes but have some consideration for rsidents. I live in the nw district and like my neighbors are very concerned about having those dreadful meter boxes in front of our homes. thank you for taking down our property values.

When it comes to parking, one thing I hope you'd consider is aesthetics. Parking meters and parking lots are ugly and should be minimal. Lots should include vegetation and the surfaces should be made to absorb water, to reduce run-off.

Provide as much parking as is possible. No restrictions.

Parking spaces should have multiple uses. Office parking available at night for restaurants and theatres, school and church parking lots available off hours for other uses. It's crazy to have spaces open and not used when the parking needs are so great. Quit dreaming about people living without cars and require residential buildings to put in parking.

Parking and gas are too cheap. Until the prices rise, people will prefer to drive and demand free parking.

I will always support efficiency, but parking should cost more than public transit for the individual.
I live in NW pdx and after 15 years of people parking free and riding the streetcar free they finally are doing something. Like bike stuff this was something the city did to put it on some planners' award list. Poorly planned and executed clogging up parking in NW .... typical tired of story not enough funds to ensure riders pay.

Efficient land use and people's safety.

Cruising around looking for a parking spot is one of my pet peeves. When I drive, I'm happy to pay for parking. Lots should be cheaper than street parking. I support the move to the NW parking plan. Even better will be if it is enforced.

Consider reducing parking close to intersections. Everywhere else I have lived, you can't park 10-15 feet from an intersection. It makes a HUGE impact on visibility for all users.

Charge for parking wherever market for parking will support it, including on-street parking in neighborhoods. Do not force buildings to have off-street parking. Create policies that encourage more smaller businesses close to customers. There is no reason all the public including those who do not own cars should pay for public facilities to store private vehicles. Ownership of a vehicle (or many vehicles) does not entitle the owner to free storage at public expense.

Charge for on-street parking wherever demand will support it. Free up on-street parking by reducing long term storage of multiple vehicles instead of forcing apartment dwellings to have off-street parking.

Apartment dwellers are not well served by new parking regulations in NW Portland.

Admitting the inescapable fact that we need parking structures, a lot more of them, and that they ought to be underground, no matter how much developers might whine about the cost.

Yes, shared parking is great. Increase the cost of parking wherever possible. Parking is one of the major drivers of mode choice.

Yes - BUT doesn't making parking more efficient promote more 'drive & park' behavior? There's a part of me that definitely wants to make parking harder in order to drive people to public transit... but that seems too mean spirited to really enact!

While no one likes it (including me) it seems to make sense to increase the areas where street parking is metered, e.g. like the recent change at Washington Park.

We should really curtail parking in the downtown and centers near public transit.

We should dramatically decrease the number of on street parking available metro wide. We should lower the number of parking spaces required for apartments/ condos. We should get rid of free on street parking.

Using existing funds.

There should be no free city-sponsored parking. On-street parking should be at market rates, and should be dynamically priced based on demand.
Some caution needs to be exercised so that businesses with only paid parking aren't at a disadvantage with malls. Or have more businesses give a discount on customer parking. Improve the ease of using parking meters—I find it tricky to pull out the receipt.

Require local governments to include shared parking policies in Comp Plan/Transportation System Plans, especially when property is developed/redeveloped. Also, find ways to encourage (not sure you can require) suburban communities to reduce available free parking in their town centers, employment centers, etc. to reduce SOV vehicle travel.

Require developers to include some parking on their projects; no free parking anywhere, including in Northwest Portland. Put even more restrictions on the use of handicapped placards. Reinstate fareless square - I never go downtown anymore.

Reduction in personal car ownership would mean fewer needed parking spaces.

PLEASE INSTALL A CITYWIDE PARKING PERMIT SYSTEM NOW. This would be the best way to capture costs from all private auto users in the city, manage parking demand (especially in rapidly developing corridors), and also alleviate tensions with existing residents and newcomers. Please consider this ASAP.

People will drive less if it is less convenient, don't prioritize making parking convenient or cheap, make parking expensive and use those funds towards public transit.

People need to pay for the use of public space. parking is underpriced or free all over the city.

Parking spaces should be priced, if public, and taxed, if private, to encourage the best and highest use of the land required.

Parking should not be subsidized.

Parking should be more expensive. The private use of public space should be paid for.

Parking must be priced in more places.

Parking management is key to making the other strategies work.

Park and ride, parking structures in places like Alberta Street and Mississippi Ave, with a little trolley going up and down the street to take people to shop and eat. Keep popular shopping streets car free.

No parking mandates for new construction. Free street parking is not a right. Users of parking should pay for it.

No more rate increases.

No more condominium/apartments permits without adequate on site parking.

New multi-family housing units being built should be REQUIRED to have underground parking facilities. 40+ units/parking doesn't cut it... ALL new multi-fam housing developments should have deeded parking for residents. Pressure on neighborhood streets (and neighbors) is souring the perception of urban density. Even with great transit, most people are still going to own a car, for travel out of town.
Need parking meters everywhere; reduce the size of business lots or penalize businesses for offering free parking in places like Lloyd Center or Washington Square. Make them have pay lots and offer subsidized transit passes.

Need LOTS more park and ride options. Currently they are filled shortly after 7 AM on weekday mornings. I can appreciate that the new 'meters' are a lot cheaper to maintain - but it is awful when you’re shopping..... You might take a lot longer, or a lot less time shopping than you think - so you either risk getting a ticket or wasting money. Isn't there a technology that would allow charging after the fact for the actual time you used a space?

More park and ride.

Low priority as much has already been done.

Let the smart cars park the way they were intended, they take up less space (two per space!) and maybe there would be more on the road!

Larger vehicles should be required to pay more for parking - motorcycles, scooters, smart cars should be given incentives for use by reduced parking fees.

Incentives should be given to people who do not commute alone, who use alternative means for commuting -- make it cheaper to park if you car share, make cheaper if you ride a scooter, make public transport a really good deal.

I would like to see a transit systems development charge instead of onsite parking.

I think the county is moving to fast on this and people cannot afford the money that is being invested at this time. People need time to catch up. It would be nice to see a little more accountability and transparency on the gov. agenda's.

I think metered parking should definitely be on the list.

I think increased investment in park-and-ride or bike-and-ride sites is important.

Funnelling those in transit toward mass-transit or bike or walking transit as much as possible, when possible.

Eliminate free parking on public streets. Charge progressive development fees/taxes for establishments that require large amounts of parking.

Efficient is good.

D/K

Congestions pricing. Meters on Hawthorne and Alberta and Mississippi. Remove parking and replace with protected bike lanes. Parking downtown should cost a lot more than a round trip bus fare.

Citywide parking permits districts ASAP please! I live in NE Portland, with tons of infill and you can see a cultural battle as new households are built and former residents compete for limited parking in ROW, surprisingly, no one parks in their driveways or garages!? Please charge for parking citywide to reduce these conflicts and recuperate expenses associated with private vehicle storage in city ROW and our public spaces.
471 97211 Charge for all on street parking.

472 97211 Available parking is important to any business, I love the idea of park & ride for transit like Lloyd Center cinemas was for the fareless square access to the max... more parking is not necessarily the answer but more efficient would be great!

473 97211 All while keeping them affordable, or restrict parking so more people use public transit and improve overall public transit so I can get anywhere I want at the same speed I could in a car.

474 97211 Absolutely need more managed parking. Important to price parking appropriately. As a home owner, I would be comfortable buying a parking permit for the right to park overnight on the street.

475 97212 Yes, but - it's already a crazy experience trying to figure out the specific parking rules in areas of the city. If going in this direction there needs to be a simpler set of tools available for finding spaces & figuring out what rules apply at any given time.

476 97212 We should not privilege driving and parking above other forms of transportation. It's okay to ask us to start paying to park in our neighborhoods, especially if it's well-managed.

477 97212 Utilize existing space more efficiently.

478 97212 Too often cars are parked right up to the crosswalk on all sides on narrow streets (busy streets, too) making attempted crossing dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

479 97212 This is especially an issue in the areas where apartment buildings without parking have been built. I don't think cities should allow this -- there needs to be a minimum amount of parking provided, even if tenants have to pay for a parking space.

480 97212 This is a no-brainer. Free parking is bad.

481 97212 The very large lot at the Regal Cinema at Lloyd Center is a potential source for more park and ride. City should work with Regal to work out a system that uses the space better. Perhaps a portion could be a daily or monthly fee lot. Use income for staff to enforce and share "net" profits with Regal.

482 97212 Stop building apartment complexes without parking.

483 97212 Policies encouraging shared parking, gradual reduction in surface parking lots.

484 97212 Please see my earlier comments.

485 97212 Parking should be a much bigger revenue generator than it is. Not only would that increase use of alternate transit, it would erode the sense of entitlement homeowners have towards street parking. That entitlement drives nimbyism which in turn limits housing in the inner city where it is has the most environmental benefits.

486 97212 Parking on public property should cost more than on private property. at least the same. street parking should be much more expensive than off-street due to the convenience factor.

487 97212 Parking is currently highly subsidized and should be expensive in order to use the roads and space for their greatest good (which is definitely not storage for private vehicles).
Parking is already oversupplied in our region and should be reduced in favor of other land uses. Park-and-ride facilities for transit are not money well spent - they primarily benefit higher-income residents and do not meaningfully impact transit mode share.

Parking for homeowners in neighborhoods that are growing more dense and have more commercial traffic, maybe we need neighborhood permits such as are used in San Francisco.

One thing to consider is the continued emphasis on building high-density multi-unit housing with no off-street parking (especially underneath the structures). This frees the developers from the cost and responsibility of providing a proportion of the tenants with off-street parking, while adding pressures on the city and neighborhoods and leaving them with even less parking options. I believe that those who choose to take one of the off-street parking spaces at a new development should expect to pay for the use of that space, thereby giving a cost advantage to those residents who do not need to use a space (e.g. they do not have a vehicle).

Motorcycles should be allowed to park in the yellow area between two car-parking spaces. With today's smaller car, it is not so important to have this "escape" space for cars.

More pricing is needed.

More park and ride options. Many people will take a car part way but finish the trip by bike/walking/mass transit if there is a safe, reliable place to park. It's not 100% car free but it's a major step.

More light boards about available parking in downtown and similar areas. Get Regal Cinema to share Lloyd Center lot with people using MAX. Perhaps charge a fee, especially for Blazer games. Encourage churches to consider developing their parking lots for affordable housing with parking garages built in for Sunday services.

Metro needs to stop giving developers a free pass on parking and putting the burden on local neighborhoods. If the developers say they can't turn a profit by building parking for their developments, then they don't have a good business plan. Period. The city doesn't let restaurant not pay plumbing and sewer addition fees, or pump it out on the the street, why should housing developers be able to?

Like all the others, this is important and valuable - though hardly where I'd want lots of money spent.

Keep reducing free parking and use interactive technology and pricing to increase utilization of parking inventory and minimize congestion caused by parking search.

Investments in smarter use of existing parking could offset the opportunity cost of wasting more space on additional parking.

In places where parking is in high demand, the price of parking should rise to meet and collect on that demand. In locations equipped with the networked pay stations, prices should also rise/fall during times of high/low demand. Generally, public parking spaces should be a source of revenue, and should take into account the true value of the spaces were they to be allocated to some other commercial purpose.
In inner northeast there are high rises being built that are bringing greater density. And most of the people have cars. I would love to live in a community where this wasn't necessary, but we are too spread out and have too few transit options. So parking should be a part of any housing developments.

I live in a high density, close-in neighborhood in Portland and am constantly frustrated about finding parking. I just want to park my ONE car in front of my single family home. I have two kids in car seats, so parking up the street is not safe and very inconvenient. Portland is pushing families out by not allowing for parking permits for home owners in front of their house. I wonder too if our neighborhood is being used by Max riders since we are in walking distance.

I have to say I'm very disappointed in the parking program. 1. Who is the brain (or lack there of) that put two hour meters that go until 10:00 on NE Broadway near the Moda Center? Essentially you're saying you can't park there and go to a concert or Blazer game. Hogwash. 2. It seems you're putting parking meters in places that should have free street parking (low volume retail and commercial areas) and that it isn't fairly spread around the city. 3. You're parking fines are way too high.

I am concerned about the City of Portland's approval of apartment buildings that don't have adequate parking for tenants. That's inconsiderate of neighbors.

How other cities do this?

Hopefully both parties can reach a compromise about shared parking.

Eliminate half the "loading zone only" spaces & restrict trucks to late night & early am deliveries, or to certain days. FAR too many spaces downtown that most drivers can't even use.

Downtown parking should cost significantly more. Congestion pricing. Parking spaces near cross walks should be eliminated to allow drivers to see pedestrians.

Don't know, but again positive incentives for walking, biking and public transit should reduce the problems related to parking. I often use the bus or MAX to get downtown because i don't want to pay for parking, it's getting more difficult to drive downtown and back, parking is hard to find and getting more expensive and taking public transit reduces my opportunity to be involved in an accident.

Don't allow apartment buildings without enough parking for residents. It only compounds the problem.

Cost and efficiency.

Charge for parking at transit stations -- that's the way it works in any major city I've lived in, and people never seemed to have trouble paying for it (including myself, considering the alternatives).

Change zoning laws so that parking isn't required. Don't require auto space for homes. Focus on development for people and living rather than for autos.

But I still prefer less focus on cars and more focus on pedestrians, bicycling, and public transportation.

Bring demand based parking meters to all neighborhoods with meters. Bring parking meters to business districts.
As someone who parks downtown twice a day, there is not enough parking to meet demand. Nevertheless, it is better, in terms of a sustainable system, to control supply than try to meet the demand.

As other communities in the world have demonstrated, public spaces can be transformed to active human uses when parking management strategies are used that disincent auto use and incent biking, walking, and transit use.

As I say, the way these questions are worded it is hard to say no. Of course I want our parking policies to make efficient use of land and parking spaces. who wouldn't?

And be really careful when building new retail/residential in-fill that we aren't assuming people won't drive when they actually will.

Address resident parking vs. limited parking facilities for new multifamily housing in neighborhood or small town center areas.

A fair price needs to be established for parking so parking isn't free.

Allows more land to be available for development, generating local and state revenue*. This is the buzz phrase for building on every sliver of land. Large apartment complexes being built with no parking because the people who rent them won't have cars. That’s a laughable assumption. I do not support the intense infill density. I am a lifelong Portlander. One of the aspects of living in Portland was the breathing room. We’re destroying that part of the city and creating a city where only the hip and rich can afford it. I marked this question as "yes" but with many, many caveats.

Yes - but I am concerned about the cost of disabled parking. There are very few public parking spaces designated - but now we pay no matter where we park. More input is needed by the affected communities.

With reservations. Making more land available for development should not be a goal... it's the damn problem! Parking is a cost of doing business for businesses... generating income for the city by charging citizens for the right to spend money in Portland is wrong headed. This is business managing government, not the other way around. Parking is about efficiently getting people to businesses and residential destinations efficiently and effectively. You are clearly thinking about this the wrong way.

When parking in the right of way is in high demand, it should automatically trigger parking management strategies that properly assess value to these spaces. Paid parking in commercial corridors with neighborhood permit programs for the side streets should implemented in many of Portland's inner neighborhoods. Revenue raised by charging for parking should be reinvested into these neighborhoods to improve sidewalks, create street seating instead of car parking at key destinations, and provide access for people on bikes with bicycle facility improvements and bicycle parking on these same streets.

We need to price parking everywhere. Parking isn't "free" and should not be treated as such.

This might be the most overlooked land use lever we have in changing behavior. It might not be popular, but it needs to happen.
There are so many new apartment complexes being built on the eastside of Portland without parking. This is pushing new residents to park on the streets. High density housing needs to include sufficient parking. It's not ok to just assume that everyone who lives in the new housing will bike or walk.

The volume of vehicles that will be parking at a park-and-ride location.

The above examples cover most of what I would address in this category. I would like to see parking lots utilize more bioswales and/or build of solar collection capacity. I would give incentives for parking lots that retrofit my suggested improvements.

Street parking charges should be implemented in centers and corridors before public money goes into transportation improvements there.

Should review handicap placards every year. Make sure they are not being abused. Training on how and when they are to be used. I often see individuals using them when the person they are given to are not in present.

Raise parking fees and parking tickets. There is already enough parking spaces downtown Portland already.

Portland's done a pretty good job of limiting parking. People complain about the lack of parking, but a little pain will get them to get out of cars.

People are not entitled to park their cars on public property.

Parking should be priced everywhere that demand frequently exceeds supply.

Parking is part of our transportation system. One thing I have observed lately is the development of multi-story housing, with no onsite parking. This puts a strain on our neighborhoods, as we now have to accommodate these additional cars. The cars crowd the streets, and make cycling that much more risky in some places. Portland should not allow such structures be built without onsite parking.

Park-and-ride options, higher inner-city parking fees, shorter time allotment at meters, more meters in high traffic areas.

Park and ride for transit would reduce some congestion and therefore is a plus. All new apartment developments should be required to provide off street parking spaces for each unit.

Park and ride at least encourages people to get out of their cars for part of the ride ... probably to the first point in the route where transit is available. Make parking expensive. Tightening up the handicap rules has helped. Now we need more enforcement of who really needs it. Shorter times on permits, make people get "re-evaluated" more often.

Only support part of this: more shared parking, with an emphasis on helping people park once in a neighborhood and then do all their errands within that area on foot.
More parking meters in business districts; If the parking isn't important enough for people to pay for, then replace it with bike lanes. Increase public ownership/management of parking facilities outside of Downtown Portland. The MLK Blvd. and Powell Blvd. corridors have a number of publicly owned parking lots (owned by PDC and ODOT, respectively) that reduce the need for individual businesses/apartments to provide parking, lowering the cost of housing/doing business, and increasing parking utilization.

Market pricing wherever possible would accomplish most of this.

Maintain and strengthen codes that require businesses to provide for adequate parking and/or contribute to funding alternative transportation options for customers/employees prior to approving development plans or permits. Locate bike warehouse options like OHSU around town.

Lower parking fees and taxes.

Improving parking should not be equivalent with more development or more parking lots.

I also think any development must have parking connected with it, instead of depending on neighborhood street parking. This burdens areas unduly.

Eliminate free parking.

By all means, charge for parking. Parking costs money.

Assess the use of handicap cards and stickers being used with on street parking downtown.

Are we making parking too cheap? Has everyone at the table read "The High Cost of Free Parking"? (author Donald Shoup).

We should go back to free parking on Sundays and after 6 PM. People should not have to be penalized for driving. If we had less parking meters in neighborhoods we would get traffic flowing easier. It should also be mandatory for business and apartments owners to provide some parking.

We should definitely manage parking, and use it as a transitional measure to a reliable public transit system.

Use technology to make paying for parking convenient (SMS payments, for example) and charge a lot for it. Provide district parking programs for residents and meter more close-in neighborhoods.

This is going to be the most important strategy for the region to tackle. We are already doing lots of good work in land use and transportation infrastructure, but nobody wants to talk about parking management. Messaging is important - parking management does not necessarily mean charging for parking. There is a whole range of tools out there that we are not using or not using enough.

Stop providing free parking. Charge for all publicly provided parking.

Seniors and people with disabilities need access to convenient parking, so we need to make sure their needs are kept at the forefront.

Right now we have socialism for parking. Why is this valuable resource, public right of way and land for parking, not better managed? We need public information about parking. Right now people expect free parking either in front of their house or in the middle of the city as a God given right.
Require new residential development to provide SUFFICIENT parking for residents. Prohibiting commercial vehicles from parking on residential streets. Close-in park and ride facilities.

Private bus or passenger van parking spots.

Please require parking spaces in new apartment buildings. Not having parking isn't going to make people drive less—we'll just turn into San Francisco where people still drive but have to circle the block a million times to find a parking spot.

Please please push to implement parking pricing and management region-wide. Market based pricing—we should not subsidize parking anymore.

Parking spaces are often very close to the intersection, leading to blind corners (especially in residential neighborhoods). There should be a somewhat larger no-parking zone around intersections.

Parking should not be free in business areas, and should be removed strategically to allow dedicated bike lanes and transit.

Parking should be priced—that space in Portland is incredibly valuable.

Parking should be metered or designated. I live in inner se Pld where street parking has become contentious for residents in a neighborhood with many shared driveways or no driveways. Narrow streets.

Not sure. Maybe more park and ride? Ongoing attention to problem areas. Better communication with neighborhood and business groups.

No new taxes or fees for consumers or businesses.

Neighborhoods should have the final say in parking in their own neighborhood. We do not need city leaders dictating how and where we can park. We need more free street parking for business, not less and not the stupid less than 2 hr. limit.

Many more designated spaces for electric vehicles, especially in downtown, and allow designated EV spaces for residential neighborhoods in front of people's homes & apartments (with help/incentives to set up charging stations) & apartments. Also significantly more bike parking across all commercial areas.

Make sure that longtime residents still have a free place to park and aren't squeezed out by parking meters or parking garages or new residents. I say this as an 11-year resident of Portland who has not owned a car during any of my time in this city.

Let's do away entirely with free, subsidized on-street parking. What about requiring an annual parking pass for every vehicle?

It is ridiculous that there isn't more shared parking between businesses. Be creative re parking policies.

It depends on what they are. As appropriate turn underutilized parking into public use like parks and plazas.

Implement the Denver model of tying the cost of street and other subsidized public parking the cost of a bus ticket. Implement more metered parking throughout Metro.
I think free parking should be discouraged except in transit lots. Neighborhoods should have parking permits and metered parking.

I support the idea of less free street parking - the streets are a shared resource, and people should pay for the ability to 'store' cars on the street at all times. More efficient use of the space is good.

I suggest more free parking for residents in neighborhoods and timed restrictions for people who don't hold parking permits in that neighborhood.

I say do away with free parking throughout downtown or in other high-traffic areas. And up the rates! Make convenient parking expensive. Have lots of free parking at transit centers and quick, convenient shuttles. Maybe even a toll to just drive through downtown.

I hope the need for parking will be reduced and excess parking can be used for public needs.

I don't have enough knowledge to answer this question - so I guess we all need more of an introduction and discussion to parking options.

I do support more careful limitations and management of parking, however, I don't think every residential area or main street needs to have parking permits.

I checked yes for implementation of policies to reduce space taken by parking. Downtown is full of empty lots; researching how to cut back on wasted space and still meet the needs of drivers could be a good investment.

HELL YES!

Free parking...it will overwhelm the current parking infrastructure FORCING people to bike, walk etc.

Free and underpriced parking is a egregious example of the mismanagement of public property. Nowhere else in our community can a private individual monopolize a public resource (to the exclusion of all others) virtually indefinitely.

Depends on how you do it. But I see opportunity there... Church parking for one thing could be used at other times... So could mall parking.

Creative ways to share parking in existing lots and on-street - or even in private driveways. Ex: I would love to be able to rent out my driveway to people shopping on Division (or Hawthorne). I live between the two streets. In some cities people are willing to park several blocks away to frequent a shop; or live in an apartment. There's no need to create parking for everyone exactly where they need it at all times. That's 1960s thinking.

Conflict between regional policy and city policy that allows apartment building without parking planning.

Charging high prices for parking -- prices that make it a cheaper option to walk, bike and bus-- should be an important part of this equation.

Charge more for the parking spaces we already have.

Bike parking and EV parking with charging are important too.
As Portland grows, parking is going to become a bigger problem. We are already seeing it in East Portland where there have been many major apartment buildings built without on-site parking. I don't think putting in meters everywhere helps. And I think it's stupid to assume everyone will just ride bikes. Even bike commuters have cars they park and drive only on the weekend.

As much as I dislike promoting driving it is unfair to local residents when new developments don't include sufficient parking. As long as the costs are small.

Apartment buildings with more than a few (3 or 4) units should be required to furnish off-street parking for their tenants.

Again, I support this, but priorities are safe, reliable street/lane/pathways for biking and walking, and more frequent busses (particularly at night, when service plummets).

Yes, yes, 1000 times yes. Current parking is offensively cheap.

Yes, but we need to make this one easy to use. Not walking a block to a machine that might or might not work, return to the parked car etc...we need something more efficient for quick stops, especially in areas of congestion. I also think the more challenges urbanized drives have with parking, the more they will start thinking outside the box and again, if they have reliable frequent affordable public transportation, that could be an easier choice.

We need to manage on-street parking using pricing and other tools, and let the market decide on off-street parking. Let's have local jurisdictions stop forcing people to have parking on their private property whether they want it or not.

We have to figure out how to charge for the use of the public right of way which is now being used for private storage.

Use price to control density. No sense in a standard price.

Those who value and propagate the "free market" should be the first to want the cost of parking to at least, pay for itself, and let supply and demand dictate. Without massive public subsidy parking a car would quickly rise to a level were people will seek to avoid motor vehicle use in a dense city.

This is the least important of the suggestions so far.

Stop permitting multiple-unit housing that has no designated parking. Stop selling out neighborhoods so developers can make more money!

Stop allowing businesses to turn parking places into outdoor seating. Do they pay anything for this? or this is just another example of anything business wants is ok by us and oh by the ways let us stick the taxpayers.

Safe bike routes should have priority over parking (this did not happen on the 28th Avenue bike route).

Prioritize providing park-and-ride for transit.
Performance parking is a necessity. Rates should change based on time of day, availability, etc. and set high enough to discourage driving. Also, users should be able to pay for parking using smartphone similar to Washington DC's Park Mobile app.

Parking policies are a great way to make mass transit or biking more convenient than driving.

No comments.

Make parking in congested areas more expensive. Expand park-and-ride options. Do they make folding cars? Smaller cars means more room for peds and bikes.

Lots of new multi-units are being built with no internal parking spaces, forcing more pressure on the limited street parking. This is just plain silly. Every new structure needs to include parking spaces to support its residents.

Like using technology, managing parking seems like a key part of the plan. People always gripe when their parking is limited in any way, but clearly there are too many cars and not enough spaces (in the core area at least), so it needs to be managed somehow.

Implementation of policies that improve efficiencies is desirable, but no significant additional spending, other than for increasing parking at park-and-rides that are woefully short (such as Sunset Transit Center), should be necessarily considered.

I'm frankly not so interested in parking except for needed services like delivery. I don't think we should do anything to make driving a car easier.

I support enforcement of current street laws. I see no enforcement in my local or work neighborhood. Allocate more money to the parking resources of enforcement before anything else. Park and ride for transit areas seem unnecessary right now and possibly detrimental--these just become dead zones in the community.

I live in a dense area and street parking is a mess. New buildings should have required off street parking.

I feel that on street parking often compromises the safety and efficiency of our roadways.

I am a bit weary of people complaining that they can't park in front of their houses. Managing parking means that parking is not the domain of the people wealthy enough to own a house here. More management is needed to maintain that balance of driving and other modes.

Free parking is one of the greatest inefficiencies in the urban environment. Anything that can be done to improve the use of this resource is great.

Free parking is not free. Most public parking should be metered in some way. The state could help make existing parking more efficient by using smart phone apps which show real time parking availability or forecasting.

Economist say that if you want less of something, tax it. People will drive less if it is more expensive to park and the alternative is made less risky and cheaper.
Businesses rely on convenient parking for their customers.

Absolutely! Look into Parking Benefit Districts. Parking in Portland needs an overhaul: allowing free on-street parking on both sides of the street creates visibility hazards and entitlement, and is a significant loss of potential revenue that could be used to maintain roads and build needed infrastructure for bicycling and transit. Change parking to include: resident-only (permit) areas, metered parking in business districts, and alternate-side parking only on residential streets.

No residential building without adequate parking included. That does not mean clogging streets of private homes with cars from apartment dwellers.

more metered parking, and rates should increase during peak density times to de-incentivize single-occupant driving in the city core.

Get cars out of inner city!!! Clogged streets are not safe and the fumes are a hazard!

Any new residential building must include sufficient parking for full tenancy, problems only created when this doesn't happen. Parking must be fair to all users in an area and not favor a group over another (shoppers vs workers). Also need to revisit disabled parking downtown as many cannot move their cars 2-3 Times per day.

Yes, right now parking is too cheap for the space it takes up.

Yes, also bike to work areas in parking areas. Incentivizing public transit and non motor vechicle programs.

The cost of parking, especially "free" parking, needs to be more obvious and understood, perhaps more priced by the market. Increase expectation that storing a vehicle costs money. When I pay to park my car, I realize that I put myself in a position to pay extra because this doesn't come free.

The amount of wasted parking out there at any one time is sickening. Between empty lots, empty garages, and on-street parking, we have vastly too much parking. As long as "managing parking" goes along with reducing overall volume, I would support it.

Require business to open their parking lots to non-customers during the business's own closed hours. Use a tax incentive - either a tax if they don't comply or a tax-break if they do.

PRICE PARKING!

Please stop subsidizing cars!

PLEASE stop giving away free parking. All of our city's parking spots should be metered or permitted. Car owners really should be paying to leave their cars on our streets.

Parking should not be free. Those parking spaces belong to all of us, and would be far better used as green space or public meeting space. This increases safety and reduces maintenance costs.
Parking should be premium. Permit parking in more neighborhoods, increase the cost of on-street parking, increase the areas that use paid parking to the east side, encourage home owners to build garages and driveways on the property if they are able, and make it a law that if you have a driveway/garage, your vehicle needs to live there and not on the streets. So many people do not use their driveways/garages for their vehicles and then people complain their is no street parking.. your property should be stored on your property. You should have to pay a fee to store a car on city streets.

Park and ride is a joke as there is never enough room or it is located so far from neighborhoods that it makes driving easier.

Park and ride for transit is the most important piece of parking resources.

Park and ride for transit is needed.

No metered parking on streets that are predominantly residential.

Need to provide park and ride in more places where shopping is done, i.e. Lloyd Center to downtown shopping.

My above answer of "yes" is qualified. In some places it seems planners have decided to limit parking so much as to attempt to discourage driving at all. While I can appreciate their good intentions, this can limit access for some (older people such as my parents just avoid certain parts of town altogether), and make it difficult for visitors to the city.

Meter every spot. Also institute a street cleaning schedule and make a ton off of people not paying attention to the street cleaning schedule, and we'll clean streets too! (cuz right now they suck).

Making people think about limited places to park may help people to chose better modes of transportation to that location.

Lower priority.

Just don't dissuade drunk people from leaving their cars overnight. Better to let them leave their cars and get them in the morning.

I wish businesses would be able to get a pass for occasionally utilizing loading/unloading zones; it's quite difficult to deliver things to our office downtown without parking several blocks away.

However it you are going to build more light rail and street cars we need larger and more accessible parking structures.

How will you measure these forecasted outcomes?

Demand pricing for parking spaces, less public roadway devoted to on-street parking.

1) Don't allow Central City Parking to monopolize parking. 2) In Washington Park, since meters are installed, increase the free time on a meter from 15 minutes to 1 hour. 3) Transfer ownership of the parking lots at the Oregon Zoo from City of Portland to Metro, and then provide free parking for visitors to the Zoo.

Workers cannot leave the office every couple of hours to feed the meter or find a different parking space.
There is a direct correlation between providing many non-auto transportation options and restricting parking. If you simply restrict parking without providing alternatives, you will not have community support.

Provide information to the public on the times meters are enforced. The 823-4000 info person told me Sunday parking downtown was not enforced until after 1:00pm but the meter had no information on that at all. Provide internet info on what the parking policies are throughout the city in garages and on streets. Allow for free parking near places where one only needs to drop off/pick up or spend less than 10 minutes like near a bank or post office or library.

Motorcycles and mopeds take up less space (and fuel), but are treated the same as any SUV. We should use policy to encourage more 2-wheelers downtown.

More park and ride for transit, incentivize.

Improve motorcycle parking access to encourage motorcycles and scooters. They are far more efficient and practical for commuting short distances (ie most commuters).

If it is safe, efficient and designed to help folks not punish them. If you make it so difficult to park expecting folks will then take transit, you might find business declining because no one wants to go there any more. I would dearly love to go to the Stepping Stone for breakfast but finding/paying for parking and then finding a two-hour wait to get seated - not going to happen. But then they have enough business that it doesn't really cause them any harm.

Employees cannot run out of the office every two hours to plug the machine or look for another empty parking space.

Yes, yes and yes. The business case is to maximize the value of the land by using it either for creating revenue or to have a car sit on the space for free or at a very low value. Shared parking also makes sense, though the parties sharing the space should share the cost of maintenance and liabilities.

We need to price parking accurately! It is currently WAY underpriced. Read excerpts from Donald Shoup's "The High Cost of Free Parking." It's *critically* important for everyone in Metro to become super familiar with.

Until transit is improved, park and rides are necessary and need to be expanded. Currently, to get from house to a MAX station takes close to a hour to travel 5 miles.....I usually drive and park on the street because there is no available park and ride.

Unsure.

This is a weird question. How could I say no to more efficiency? My only comment is that parking downtown on Sundays should be free again. And if it's not going to be free, it should be metered all day like any other day. Why do churchgoers get free parking?
This is a real tough one: Parking lots and on-street parking are notoriously difficult to manage efficiently, and yet, the reason I rarely shop/eat downtown is due to parking issues. My wife has cerebellar encephalopathy, so I need a parking spot when she's with me. I wish you luck on this one.

This does not seem as much a priority as other things. There should be free parking for 3 hours downtown, and then metered time. We need more parking structures or underground parking. People don't want to come downtown because it is hard to find a parking space and it is expensive. An increase in transit service would also help.

The work that Commissioner Novick did in accessing and changing the street parking meter policy and the use by disabled parkers has seen incredible results; my personal experience being a downtown employee. It is this type of thoughtful and aware policy implementation that needs to be brought forward to address this issue. Yea for Commissioner Novick.

The lack of parking leads to people driving around and around wasting gas. enough of the bio-swales. Take public agencies out of downtown Portland and site them at lightly used traffic locations. So many disabled and challenged people have no good options for avoiding the new parking fees because they are also heavy users of these services. The fees are onerous to many. Also, please provide more handicapped parking near parks and other public event locations.

Start promoting the use of smaller vehicles with cheaper parking for only smaller vehicles.

Small park and ride areas near bus stops.

Shared parking is a great idea and hopefully property owners can be approached to opt in, rather than passing regulations requiring shared lots. I hope the ideas will include solutions for issues for businesses such as who pays for maintaining a shared lot. More on-street parking can be evaluated for time limits.

Shared parking between businesses and between businesses and the public during off-peak hours would be very helpful. Would like to see structured parking w/commercial enterprises on first floor rather than any surface lots. Dense neighborhoods like Northwest and Division Street will need to provide parking in the near future.

Set aside spaces with EV charging.

Sadly, Portland needs greater parking restrictions.

Requiring new car purchases to have a designated parking location.

Provide proper enforcement of the parking regulations, such as NO PARKING in bike lanes - ticket violators regularly to get the message out to the public - walk, bike, and/or share rides.

Probably among the most controversial and difficult policies to implement.

Penalize residents of no-parking apartments who have cars.
Parking is horribly mismanaged in this town with a patchwork system of meters and/or lots. Also, there's no shortage of bicycle parking, but virtually no purpose-built slots or incentives to accommodate scooters or motorcycles, which are incredibly space and fuel-efficient vehicles. Seems hypocritical of city leaders to stress using more sustainable and efficient transportation methods, but not reward those who do.

Parking in lots should be easier and incentivized; it should cost LESS than parking on the street. Right now, street parking is cheaper, so people choose to drive around and around and around looking for on-street parking. This causes people to pay less attention to bikers, walkers and increase pollutants. If people want the quick park and go on the street, they should pay for the convenience.

Off street parking is needed throughout the region, but we need to right-size the amount of off street parking and where off-street parking is located.

No more residential or commercial development without off-street parking.

Need verses want.

More stacked parking. Parking with new construction. I haven't been down town in years. It's too difficult. I'd rather drive 10 miles to Beaverton than drive 10 miles in circles looking for parking. Don't even go Downtown for shows, etc.

More safety for storing Cycles that are parked with night lighting.

More and/or larger Park and Ride locations would be great. Redesigned street parking would be good too.

Make sure there is ample parking, and there's no disincentive to come downtown.

Make sure parking options meet area needs.

Lots of shared reduced free hard surfaces.

Limited benefit, but still a good idea.

Let's not pave paradise to put up a parking lot!

Important to give consideration and priorities to other modes of transport in addition to bicycles -- scooters and motorcycles are far more efficient than cars, tax the infrastructure at the same level as bicycles, don't take up anymore space and yet don't get any parking perks whatsoever in "green" Portland. Hypocritical.

I would support some dollars invested in this category however, it is somewhat more difficult to do in a suburban area as those areas have limited transit service and other travel options. Jurisdictions should have zoning code language that more than just allows for shared parking between businesses - it should be a requirement in the code.

I would like to see a reduction in parking downtown and the close-in east side and an increase in park and rides nearby. Drive parking costs up so they are not even close to the cost of taking MAX or the bus.

I think parking rates should be raised. Parking lots in Portland should also be assessed for not implementing storm water reduction strategies.
I support actual consideration of this option not another strategy to reduce automobile use. It is pleasant when cities make streetscape improvements that enhance the experience of shopping or dining in those areas.

I honestly don't know what level of priority is should be. I think we need to support this effort, but I don't know how it compares to other needs. I think it's awful that my employer doesn't have a parking lot, for instance, with close to a thousand people working there. Similarly, apartment complexes being built without adequate parking... and the need for more free park and rides...parking is a huge problem in Portland.

Good information about where parking can be found to reduce driving around looking for parking, which is a distraction that increases risk for non-driving people.

Focus certainly needs to be on how spaces are used and when the greatest need is. Event parking in downtown is terrible, and alternative sources for transportation at night is not much better. Spent about 10 minutes waiting to get into a parking garage for last night's symphony performance. Attendants were slow at making change, etc. Should require all parking garages operating in d/t to implement electronic machines and gate such as PDX and Portland Center Parking (I believe that's the one) where you receive a ticket upon entering then pay before you get back in your car.

Eliminate onstreet parking. Reclaim the streets for travel lanes to immediately relieve congestion and provide safe cycling and walking options.

Don't eliminate spaces. That's a terrible trend.

DO NOT charge people to use park & ride lots. they will get back in their cars.

DEPENDS!!! - Just making fewer spots or increased rates are NOT the answers! I have already stopped going downtown because of limited & overpriced parking options.

Auto use should see a relentlessly increasing user cost for parking.

Assume people will have cars first of all. Don't build apartments that don't have parking spaces. Beyond that, perhaps larger sections of the Pearl and NW 23rd avenue areas should be pedestrian only or have payable lots rather than fighting not only street parking, but the traffic issues that come with lots of pedestrians, one way streets, and stop signs rather than actual signals. No one likes meters that you can't refill if you need more time....sorry.

Taxing parking by making it harder to find and more expensive is a way to nudge people to alternative transportation, but alternatives have to be viable first.

We cannot sacrifice long-term environmental health to short-term convenience privileges of personal vehicle drivers who have alternatives for transportation.

They need some kind of security persons at those park and rides. My best friends car got stolen from the Gateway park and ride.
The problem of individuals with handicapped passes needs to be addressed. There is no reason they should be parking for free the entire day on an otherwise metered street.

So far parking is such a pain I never come downtown by car anymore. I also avoid neighborhoods like NW 23rd or the Pearl because it is just too much trouble to drive down and park. Make shuttles that connect with MAX to shopping neighborhoods that are fast and efficient. Or shuttles from larger parking lots, like park and rides.

Provide 2 parking spaces per unit, be it multi or single-family dwellings.

more park and rides for the max. They fill way to fast. make sure there is parking for business. sometimes you can't find a place to park and then there's the open lot across the street you can't use because of restrictions. it's a crazy mixed up system.

Make damn sure that new housing includes adequate parking for each unit!

Maintain only existing parking access and avoid additional parking access. As well, reasonable parking access to electric vehicle charging stations in order to maintain and improve interest in alternative motor-vehicle fueling choices of consumers.

If you are not in the core downtown areas then there is a significant excess of parking available in lots. In downtown Portland it always seems like a significant # of on street spaces are always unavailable. I usually use the smart parks when visiting but if I was just going somewhere for 5 minutes, using a garage would be foolish.

Encourage large retail businesses to rethink parking lot size. Most sites provide entirely too many parking spaces, resulting in valuable green space covered over with concrete.

Don't take parking away for transit. there tends to be a lack of parking at apartments and business so that we are forced to take transit. Not everyone is willing or able to take transit so that needs to be considered.

But I think Portland does a good job here already, with some few exceptions.

Are no vehicle zones being considered? Could all of downtown Portland be designated as only pedestrian?

We need to stop providing free parking. Obviously easy to say and very difficult to do. However, as long as motorists generally have free, convenient, and plentiful parking - why would they chose a transportation "option?"

We have way too much land tied up in parking places. Anything to reduce the amount of parking is great.

The use of public right of way for parking should be compared to the benefit of using that land for transportation options, including sidewalks, bicycles lanes, multiuse paths and express transit lanes. We cannot afford to just give away vast amounts of right of way to store cars and trucks.
SW Portland needs a NO CHARGE park and ride for the MAX line. There is very little parking near the MAX for long term parking e.g., at least 3-4 hrs. MAX is more convenient and runs longer hours than buses in SW Portland. Buses are not available in most of SW Portland after rush hour and walking 1/2 mile + on dark, narrow streets with NO sidewalks is not a safe option for pedestrians using buses that run past rush hour.

New building plans/permits should make sure there are adequate parking, and even additional parking. Downtown is already over-restricted making it a deterrent to working, shopping, living. Also the park-ride needs to be patrolled like they do in Seattle. And the transit centers need to allow for overnight parking so people can park and tax the max to the airport.

More park and ride resources.

More park and ride.

More park & ride spaces for close in SW MAX riders. Add more floors to Sunset Park & Ride structure!

Modern technology makes this a no-brainer. Just do it.

Many parking business parking spaces are empty at night but inaccessible to the public. Timed parking would allow this space to be used efficiently.

I do not think parking will have a great impact on emissions, but it would bring more people to downtown for even further revitalization.

Have more businesses/gov't. pay for employees public transportation passes.

Design parking incentives to support transit use.

But only if the "community's implementation" recognizes people drive--sometimes have to drive--and that parking is a real need.

The number of apartments and businesses in an area.

Surface and structured parking should be minimized and well managed to bring income to communities and also discourage driving where possible.

Please avoid the godawful 3 foot long signs of when and why a person can park.

More metered and paid parking to encourage use of other options.

Medium priority.

Maximize efficiency, maximize cost vs. benefits.

Invest our money in economically sustainable projects.

Increase parking fees.

Incentives to remove surface lots - replace them with multi-level mixed-use facilities or underground parking.

If we can reduce the use of cars, can we reduce the need for more and more parking?
I find the recent building of large apartment structures in already populated areas without providing additional parking spaces very hard to understand. The impact on neighborhoods is terrific. Is there not a better way to go?

Green practices, reducing heat island effect, reducing impervious area.

Do we really need all those loading zones? Do we really need to block off street parking for weeks on end using those red and white traffic signs? Load ins/out only take a few minutes, 30 tops, and I understand we don't want to block traffic but it gets rather frustrating when I can never park in that loading zone that is never sees any loading.

Why would we have implemented policies in the past that were inefficient? We should make more parking available too, that would be even more efficient.

This should actually provide adequate space for parking, and not be an excuse for limiting parking opportunities.

Some of the restricted areas are too restricted and unable to understand (NW).

Only use permeable surfaces when building more parking and install bioswales and other runoff traps in existing parking lots.

Number of spaces needed to support local businesses. More spaces reduces amount of orbiting drivers will do, thus reducing pollution.

Not sure.

Not a fan of metered parking in Tigard... would probably kill downtown Tigard. I support park-n-ride lots where people can leave their cars and ride an express bus/Max to work.

Need to insure that new housing have adequate parking in there site plan.

More parking at Sunset Transit Center!! this is an absolute must! I would be willing to pay a monthly parking pass fee so I can ensure I have a spot! It fills up by 7:15 am and spots often do not open up until after 3 pm. Students should have priority on spots.

Make more parking available.

Long term investment without clear short term benefits clarifying short term benefits will make more politically palatable option to use vs requirement to use strategies.

It would save a lot of gas if we could buy a parking spot, convenient to our destination before we left our home PC.

It would be nice to have a section for motorcycles because several of them could fit into the same space as one car and seeing a space taken up by a moped is rather annoying.

It really ticks me off to be called to high-density development (townhouses and row houses) that have no place for visitors to park. And Portland in particular needs to stop allowing development without adequate parking.
Instead of large, single-level parking areas, we need to build more underground/multi-story parking areas.

I support my city in developing parking plans - parking is a LOCAL matter that needs to be addressed by locally elected, locally accountable city councils. NOT the regional Metro that is Portland heavy, Portland centric. Portland does not know what is best for Forest Grove or Oregon City. Forest Grove knows what is best for Forest Grove or Oregon City. Oregon City knows what is best for O.C. They both have very different parking management programs. Why should we force Forest Grove into Oregon City's plan?

I support **MY** (Tigard's) parking policies. I do not support Portland's parking policies. If Portland is going to demand they be the center of our region and want the region to be a part of its city, it needs to understand that the vast majority of regional residents drive. If it doesn't want to provide parking, it should fully expect regional destinations be located outside of the City of Portland.

Facilitating more parking spaces just encourages more single occupant car driving and is a poor use of tax dollars. However, park and ride facilities are a good use of public funds.

Churches, theaters and shopping malls all have underused parking lots during the working day and then maxed out on the evenings and weekends. Let's look at established parking lots first and work out shared parking agreements beneficial to those businesses before investing in more Park and Ride lots.

All the things listed above, including ways for people to use cars for essentials without exorbitant costs for parking or using alternative transportation.

But we should limit the number of car parking spaces in the central city. Back to the future, the parking lid was a good idea.

There should be a sufficient number of parking spaces for the expected number of vehicles. If parking spaces are consistently lacking, it results in wasted trips around the block "shopping" for parking spaces. More parking garages should be added to those areas where parking is lacking. New houses and apartments/condos should be required to provide a minimum of 1.5 parking spaces per unit, unless they are large family sized units, which would require 2.5 spaces. Parking rates could be raised in areas where parking is at a premium until parking garages are built to accommodate the persistent need.

Require developers of apartments and retail space to provide adequate underground and surface parking.

Providing more underground parking at destinations.

People who drive eco cars should pay the same as people who drive traditional cars. Do not regulate the price of parking garages. The market will show where the price point is and street parking prices should be slightly higher than what the parking garages can get so more street parking will be available, maximizing the amount the government gets for the parking spaces.

Parking is a big issue. Reducing it is counterintuitive.
More parking is why I moved our business OUT of Portland proper. More parking is a good thing. Also, technology that helps us find parking spaces is also very good. PDX has a very good system for that. Build on it.

More park and ride stations would be wonderful. Large chain stores should be made to plan for parking needs and pay for them. Tigard, Tualatin, Lake Oswego area is immovable around rush hour.

Large parking areas should be minimized or placed on the outskirts of areas to encourage using transit, bikes, or walking into high density areas.

Increase shared parking. Reduce set-asides for people who aren't there. Reduce restrictions.

I'm all for making driving and parking unattractive in order to entice people to use alternative transportation choices. Pedestrians, bicycles, public transit should have priority access to key areas, but easy access to these transit options should be made available.

Emphasize shared business parking space and park and ride.

Efficient management is always a good idea. However Portland often adopts policies based on bad assumptions. Since many young people bike or take transit to work, the city has allowed apartment construction without parking spaces for residents. The problem is that most of those people who bike and take mass transit also own cars for shopping or weekend trips. So they still need to park somewhere and when they leave their cars on the street, it hurts local business and is very inefficient.

Yes, BUT, I would hope that we're moving in a direction of needing less parking. A pipedream, I know.

Why isn't this being done now?

The biggest problem in our area is insufficient parking at the Sunset Transit Center. The parking garage usually fills up by 7:30 AM on weekdays. More people would take the MAX (and hence not drive on Rt. 26) if they could park at the transit center. Trimet should make some kind of deal with the operators of the shopping center on the south side of Rt. 26. They have a large parking lot that is not used much.

Stop accommodating free parking. Charge for parking, or better yet remove parking so that people who walk or ride can use that public space. Our public space should not be used for people to store their private property!

See previous comments related to the STC. I expect there are similar problems at other transit garages.

Perhaps people don't need all of the vehicles they own - one per driver sounds good. Also, encourage people to clean out their garages so they can be used for vehicles. Smart people and employers will consider parking options as they're locating life/work. Paid parking isn't a bad idea.

Parking needs of the neighborhood should be seriously considered. I still think there should be a parking garage in NW Portland even though the residents say no. What are they thinking. Apartments shouldn't be built without adequate parking.
Parking and roadways should be used as efficiently as possible to mitigate their impacts. - Parking and roadways should not be expanded if possible - Active transportation and alternative transportation options should be prioritized as ways to decrease the need for additional parking or roadways - Greater emphasis could be placed on car-share programs and other infrastructure to help reduce the need for multiple-car households - Large-scale above-ground parking at transit centers should not supplant mixed use development and infrastructure that can create vibrant community centers around important transportation hubs.

Park and ride for transit is really important, especially for the MAX. In neighborhoods where parking has become an issue, i.e. Division, it would be interesting if businesses and community spaces could devise a way to share parking lots. For example, during the day the public couldn't park there, but during prime dinner time they were open to the public when those businesses would be closed anyways. I am not supportive of parking meters on the East side. Many houses on the East Side do not have driveways, and these homeowners would be unfairly affected. The possibility of houses renting out their driveways during the day is also an interesting idea.

Once again deincet the use of vehicles that create pollution and congestion.

Of course the neighborhood needs to be considered BUT sometimes like in NW Portland they are just stupid. They want people to come to their businesses but don't want a parking structure because more people would come. They can get over themselves. So guess what, I don't go there even though I'd like to. It's no fun looking for a parking space of a half hour or so.

More park and ride lots in outlying areas should be considered, for both bus commuting and for the MAX trains.

Make sure that there are enough parking spaces at the park and ride lots. Having carpool only parking spaces. Have enough alternatives for street parking, which is less expensive than parking at meters. Right now, the parking lots cost the same, and sometimes more.

Make parking lots like Costco parking lots: extra wide, with a double line to make sure today's giant cars and pickups fit into the space.

Make monthly parking passes! They could be time restricted, and they could be assigned to specific garages. Then TRIMET would be better able to forecast parking space requirements for specific regions.

IMPORTANT: apartment/condo complexes need at minimum one carshare (zip car) parking space per x number of units; this would make it easier for residents to actually give up owning a car which they park in the neighborhood even though they rarely use it (plus, it's usually a sort of a junker, as they don't use it much). ALSO: the beaverton transit center needs a big parking structure. tailor parking times/prices to needs of the neighborhood.
I'll respond to Park and Ride in particular since I have been a longtime user of it. More thought needs to go into design. The Sunset Transit center is poorly designed. Why do you actually enter a parking garage to drop off and pick up people? That should have a separate entry and exit point. And why are there not more level parking structures? And also, if the Beaverton Transit Center is such a hub for intersecting lines, then it should accommodate the level of usage that center has.

If anyone builds a new development or a new apartment/condo they should be forced to build parking for the folks who are going to live there. They should not be allowed to count on street parking! This seems a no brainer and yet is not being done. It is very hard to park downtown and in the Pearl and almost impossible in the 23rd area.

How to do this in a way that does not increase people using private automobiles.

Easy parking conflicts with efforts to reduce vmt.

Beaverton transit center needs a multi-story parking structure!!! It's crucial to get the communities to take the lead on any of this, or for sure they'll claim it's being 'crammed down their throats.' It all needs to work as a system, appropriate to the area. I notice that the sunset bike storage, wonderful idea that it is, has very few bikes in it, ever. Find out why. Are people walking to get there? Being dropped off? Driving? Riding their bikes all the way to their destination? Keep things in better proportion to their need.

As a car driver more parking is always welcome - especially since spaces seem to keep disappearing to dining patios, bioswells, bike parking, and bike lanes. I just don't see Portland residents and businesses would be happy to lose valuable real estate to cars.

Add more meters. Add neighborhood only parking near transit centers to discourage people using Trimet from taking spots from the people who live in those neighborhoods. Raise ticket rates for people blocking sidewalks and parking in disabled spaces without being disabled.

Ability to use parking lots for businesses that are closed nights and weekends.

A few more structures would really help. How about near 23rd? How about making folks build a lot under any new building? You have the power to do this but no one seems to want to go there. The developers will do if required so screw up your courage and make them! There are too many folks having to park on the streets. We were hoping to eat out last night on East Burnside and drove around for 15 min trying to find a place to park. Wow, have you tired that lately? Many places in the city are like this as there is so little parking near/in apartment buildings and condos. Come on, do it, have them build space for the tenants.

Raise meter rates, expand meter times, add meters along commercial streets with permit parking zones in adjacent neighborhoods. Raise taxes on surface parking lots to encourage redevelopment. Expand transit to run later in the day (2:30 or 3 am) so people have the option to leave the car at home. Increase the number of taxi licenses and allow Uber-type rideshare into Portland to provide practical alternatives.
Parking should definitely be regulated! And parking lots should never be exempted from something like a street fee or transportation fee. That is madness. Look. It costs money to park in the city. That's how it goes. If it becomes too much of a pain in the ass or expensive, you'll figure out another way (such as bus or bike) just so you don't have to deal with it any more. (This happened to almost everyone I know who moved to the pacific NW with a vehicle).

Parking for the over abundance of apartment buildings going up.

More paid parking for more of the time, increase taxes on surface parking lots, limit on-street vehicle parking times to 1, 2 or 3 hours in commercial districts.

This is a need that could easily be filled by private enterprise if the land use process enabled it. I suspect that NIMBYism and other barriers to commercial lots is the problem.

The degree to which the local neighborhoods are overloaded with cars parked from elsewhere on a regular basis, i.e., around the Beaverton Transit Center, or Sunset Transit Center, or other locations where folks are desperate to use the Max or bus, but have to use their car to get to a station or stop -- because there's insufficient local transit they must drive to where they can access it! Beaverton Transit Ctr, especially, needs a 2- or 3-level parking garage, and Sunset needs to add a floor or two.

Should have parking designation for those who work in the area versus those who are there to "shop" or do business in shorter spans of time (1-2 hours). make it more expensive for long-term parking and promote park-n-ride areas. adjust short-term metered parking to not give shopping a prohibitive cost (but promotes business).

Parking policies should be established that encourage alternative transportation methods. Do not waste land and other resources creating more parking.

Park and ride! Put something closer to beaverton/portland border. Sunset parking is too small, expand parking at Sunset transit center! There's plenty of room and all the families out there will use it to get into the city.

Park and ride needs MASSIVE expansion.

Nothing, do it.

Neighborhood input.

Needs to be tired on a trial basis and honestly evaluated.

More parking spaces. Increase times allowed.

More parking is needed and for the parking to be maintained.

Making parking expensive and inconvenient for single occupancy cars is a good thing -- leveraging parking management to reduce traffic volume and encourage people to use non single-occupancy vehicles.

Increase the capacity at some of the MAX park-and-ride stations. Provide park-and-ride lots at more of the bus stops. More downtown parking available. Do not take parking away from commuting workers.
Increase park-and-ride at Sunset transit center - make use of adjacent property for this purpose, even if this must be reversed with later development.

Improve parking in some needed areas otherwise it hurts fuel efficiency and some neighborhood businesses.

I think that better planning for parking is important. However, in a city that allows high-density residential buildings to be constructed with not just insufficient parking, but no parking, I am very wary of trusting planners and politicians with authority and tax money to carry it out.

How will compliance be ensured?

Don't displace car-parking spaces in favor of bike-parking spaces until you've made it convenient to use bikes in the first place. I am thinking of the Sunset Transit Center, where parking space is already WAY too small, and some of the few spaces available were given over to bike parking. But how many of those bike spaces are actually used? Not many: no dedicated, physically-separated bike lanes are available nearby. The parking spaces dedicated to bikes are now largely just wasted space.

Nice idea; poorly thought out.

Create a system to help drivers identify parking spots without a lot of driving around looking.

Again, this seems obvious. Why aren't you doing this now?

Who would support an implementation of parking policies that make inefficient use of land and parking spaces? Who writes these surveys? This is very slanted to investing in larger government at the local level, and trying to justify it.

Shared parking between businesses should definitely be considered. I get aggravated when I see a mostly empty lot for one business while the entire street in all directions is taken.

Population, congestion, efficiency and cost.

Park-and-ride for transit users could be expanded as possible; meter more spots; increase parking charges.

Park and ride for rural suburban areas is the only way to access public transportation. I don't know enough to have an opinion about the other items.

Only if voted upon and details are included.

Must be enough parking spaces to accommodate need of folks. Driving around to find a spot is crazy. Visit the suburb malls instead of downtown.

Much like the handicap parking issue downtown, addressing incentives and perks with intended consequences is a great place to start.

Careful consideration to all options.

Yes in urban areas, but not in rural sections.

We need a smart and comprehensive policy regarding parking across the region. There is so much unused space, and the space that is used for public parking is priced well below what should be the true cost of parking your car around the city.
Keep it simple for drivers new to an area, or occasionally there, to understand without having to park somewhere in order to read 2 or 3 little signs on the block (I'm thinking of NW Portland especially,) figure out which sets of rules for which days and times might apply to them, then move the car to the "right" area ... or give up and vow never to return.

Free street parking on main connecting roads should be replaced with bike lanes/wider sidewalks when possible, such as on 28th Ave and Willamette Blvd. in Portland.

Yes, as long as we are not creating policies that encourage more access to parking in lieu of encourage people to take alternate transportation. parking should be expensive and density focused.

Trimet prices should cost less the further out you live to promote use.

Too many housing unit projects are being built without parking under the assumption that the inhabitants will use public transportation. Some own cars and it ti difficult to find off street parking.

Reducing parking could help disincentivize driving.

People's Voice!

Parking policy should support business- especially small business. Building a ton of infill with no on-site parking means that local businesses are inaccessible because all the street parking is in use by residents instead of customers.

Parking policies now are sometimes punitive and merely revenue generators, not to turn over parking for retail. No parking requirements in residential areas just creates conflicts and lowers quality of life for residents. Many people still own a car, even though using alternatives 5-6 days a week. The car goes to the coast or the mountains. We don't have hourly rail service everywhere like small European countries... Also, parking policies that ticket my car parked in front of my house for 5 days while I bus or walk to work are punitive and lower my quality of life. Stupid unintended and climate changing consequence is I have to drive my car around the block and park in different spots every day to avoid a ticket, though I had no reason other than that to start it and spew pollution.

Parking is not a given, not a right. I would like to see more space given to bike lanes than parking.

Parking for residences but encouraging people to use public transportation when possible. the only places that are really , easy to get to in portland is downtown and PSU.

Park and ride is an efficient waste of space around transit stations that could be used for transit oriented development. The city needs to charge for on-street parking city wide. Free parking encourages auto use and is a poor use of a city resource (road space).

On street parking is the largest give away we have. There is no need for a street fee if we just raised parking fees and charged for parking in trendy spots - 23rd, Hawthorne, Alberta, etc.

Nothing else to add to what the question addresses.
Make parking alternatives obvious. Where is the closest parking lot? Is there easy bike parking where there is little care parking? New apartment buildings should be required to provide a certain amount of parking and if they can’t do that, perhaps they should increase the amount of green space in their projects and increase their setbacks from the street.

It would be great for drivers to know where the empty parking spots instead of blindly driving around trying to spot them.

I believe that each home owner should be allowed 1 space in front of their home with restricted parking for them or the guest of their choosing.

How is it then, that all sorts of micro-and other small appartment buildings are going up around town without insisting having to provide appropriate parking for the new residents?

Eliminate free parking - duh.

Create incentives for property owners (even single family homes) to provide covered, street level bicycle parking. I look forward to the day when the planting strip in front of every home (where there’s a planting strip) has a dry place to lock a few bikes.

Car storage on our streets should not be free.

And signal our cars where the next available nearby parking space. Come on guys...21st century.

Any new construction must provide for maximum parking. Too much construction on division already and there is no parking. That's dumb. Even our neighborhood is crazy, it's been built up with one car garages, but each fool in the area has a full garage of boxes and 2 or 3 cars. Raise the taxes on cars, increase the parking.

Car storage on our streets should not be free.

Use this to make better use of existing parking. Providing more parking just encourages more driving.

This is absolutely key to reforming our built landscape. Free or cheap parking (including parking minimums in building codes and other parking subsidies paid by taxpayers) is the scourge of a city's life and so many good things will follow when it is priced according to its real value.

Sacrificing parking in high-density areas in favor of bioswales isn't a good idea. Bioswales are excellent features but there must be a way to design them so that they don't pre-empt parking spaces on busy commercial streets, i.e. SE Division.

Perhaps provide incentives for smaller vehicles (smart cars, bicycles, etc) by having more small spots and charging more for larger parking spaces.

Parking is a pretty big problem with all the high density residential buildings going up. Again, if we have small village-like neighborhoods that have shops and services close by then perhaps cars would be left at home.

Parking has destroyed and will continue to destroy our urban environment.
Park-and-ride is essential - this is a no-brainer! Prohibit employers from providing parking close in to downtown; instead give incentives to provide transit passes.

Increase availability of parking with charging stations for electric vehicles.

In addition, there should be an increased emphasis on reducing the number of spots available as they only serve to encourage travel by automobile.

I think that there should be less parking to encourage more use of transit.

However, parking is limited further when developers are allowed to build without providing parking for the building they are constructing. This needs to absolutely halt. Parking should be available under or on top of all buildings with/in city limits - including apartments. All new commercial buildings should be required to be "green" energy buildings - no exceptions.

Have a REALISTIC estimate of how many parking places each new dwelling will require and INSIST that developers provide that much off street parking.

Emphasis on assessing parking supply needs. Often times parking spots are over developed and sit empty. Implement a no minimum parking for new developments.

Eliminate the parking permit program that requires homeowners to pay a fee to pay on the streets in front of their own homes! The people who should pay for parking are those who do NOT live in the neighborhood. Payment at parking meters should be required all day on Sunday, not just after church. Government should NOT be subsidizing church goers at the expense of all of the rest of us. Parking meters need to allow parking for a reasonable length of time. For example, it is almost impossible to accomplish errands and appointments in downtown Portland in an hour.

Don't build more parking lots.

But shift automobile parking from 'day care' mentality of an entitlement to a shared resource. Turn asphalt fields into water treatment, CO2 reduction, renewable energy producing, and habitat providing "fields of dreams'. It and happen!

All needs including TRUE handicapped parking!

Accelerate use of real-time, internet-based parking information. Provide economic incentives for sharing use of private parking with public users. Increase park-ride options with better park and better ride options.

With an inclusion: Your allowing too much space for business and not enough for parking.

More security at park-n-rides. Create a site for airport park-n-ride with extended, gated parking for a fee.

I'm all for those outcomes, but I really don't care about parking. If parking is challenging, people won't go to an area -- and that doesn't have to be a bad thing.

Emphasis on creating alternatives to automobile traffic in high density areas so parking does not need to be expanded, requiring developers to factor in parking requirements when developing projects within the urban boundaries.
Charge more for parking - especially during peak hours. Allow the option to automatically recharge parking and/or pay on a check in-check out basis.

Can we get rid of the permit only parking - i.e., by the stadium. Around Rose Festival time, there is a great need to park in that area and there is simply no parking available. The more difficult you make it to attend events -- the less attendance you're going to have. Buildings should be constructed with parking attached -- no more of this building and requiring the tenants to park on the street. It is congesting our neighborhoods and driving people outside of the city. To be honest, I avoid downtown like the plague because it is too difficult to drive down and park.

Some areas need more creative parking options, like underground parking garages with parks and surface areas used creatively. Adequate parking near Providence Park inhibits the optimal use of the facility.

Size of cars.

Rethink "minimum" parking standards. Offer incentives for lower parking in trade for more bike/ped access and transit passes for residents.

Recognize that not everyone can use public transit to complete trips, and that the automobile will continue to be a vital part of a successful economy.

Parking should not be free, because it is not free. It has a cost and the users should start to pay more for it than they do.

Our population growth rate and the area's ability to offer attractive alternatives to the residents.

Lower priority, too.

Let's be more efficient rather than just adding more parking.

Just what the question says -- efficient use of land.

Having parking availability at park and rides similar to Tri-Met's website which details bus and MAX arrival times would help alot.

Every Park & Ride lot I have seen is over utilized. If they aren't over utilized, it is usually because of poor siting.

Consider incentives to incorporate bioswales, solar power units and permeable pavement in parking lots.

More busses.

Parking is a huge problem, especially in neighborhoods that are developing. Division, Williams, Mississippi, etc. People that drive want to visit shops and stores too, I'm sure the businesses would appreciate the action. We need parking in these places.

Parking should be more expensive. Price what people are willing to pay.

More park and ride locations.

Charge for parking based on supply demand. Have price rise and fall with demand as they are testing out in SF now.
Park-and-ride is an underused resource. If I could park at some big lot in Portland and get a ride to where I needed to go, I would visit Portland much more often because I would have to deal with less traffic. I also think that some drivers avoid meters because they don't carry cash (relying on credit/debit cards instead), and I know I'll go out of my way to find cheaper or free parking.

But if there were fewer parking spaces at places well-served by transit, fewer people would drive to those places. Would it work to have nearly no parking downtown and have shuttle buses?

Needs to be a holistic strategy to provide a usable transportation system including the road system while encouraging people to use alternative means of transportation to keep car use at a minimum.

I'd like to see on-street bicycle parking everywhere on-street car parking is located, including all residential areas. This takes a current parking system, increase the transportation options, and greatly increase the number of vehicles that can be parked (one car spot can hold 8-12 bicycles). Is converting 1% of car parking spots to bicycle parking spots too much to ask?

If I can't park there, I probably won't go there - NW21/23rd is a prime example. The smart parks downtown work very well and I'm pleased to see they're adding EV charging stations. All parking garages should have EV charging spaces, with effective policies to keep them from being blocked with non-EVs.

Include elements that are less costly and more commuter friendly at all points.

Parking is still needed for many areas to thrive. Connecting parking to transit and alt modes is key to solve last mile problems.

Effect on the price of housing for lower income families.

I would rather see an increase in parking garage space (build new or add floors) as opposed to addition of single spot meters in high density areas such as city centers.

More park and ride for transit. Please, please make it safe and clean.

Different rates for E/V's vs. ICE's; dedicated E/V parking; increasing high-capacity charging stations at parking locations.

A qualified yes. Parking is a tool, just like bike lanes, transit and street capacity, to achieve other goals. Parking management is not, itself, a goal. You first have to know what kind of place you want, how many jobs you want, what density of people, then determine what tools to use to achieve those goals.

CRIME!!!

Cap parking resources so it forces more mass transit use.

Focus should be on carpool, bike and mass transit providing spaces and charging individual travel.

I believe the government has a role to help ensure people have a place to park, by providing space and permits to private entities that want to provide space. Roads need to allow street parking in residential areas!

Again, volume of use should dictate investment.
With the construction of all these apartments in our neighborhood that have no off street parking, this is going to get pushed aside for more punitive measures.

Why would we not want to implement improvements?

We need to change people's mindset about cars and their negative impact on the environment.

We need more park and ride places. Sunset Transit Center is impossible to park after 7 a.m.

Using available resources, maybe contracting with rural churches for week day parking spots.

This will have to happen if bad planning policies remain in place for infill development. People should be able to park in their own driveway, on their street in front of their home or apt., or have some designated parking place for their personal vehicles in some fashion. Metered parking in residential neighborhoods should not happen. In commercial districts, it's used for turnover so no one extends their stay in an area too long so businesses can have more customers. End the bicycle corral & restaurant seating in the curb lanes on streets. This is a bad planning policy & takes away needed parking for businesses.

This is a no brainer. However, reducing the amount of cars with better bike lanes, mass transit that centers around a commerce hub eliminates this problem.

The safety of pedestrians, bikes, and cars.

Reduce restrictions and special designations. It wastes fuel and time looking for an open site with the right time limit.

Provide short term parking spaces in front of buildings for drop off of carpool riders. Downtown if you park temporarily to drop off you get harassed by parking patrol.

No net loss in downtown parking, require parking for new developments in downtown in the 1:1 ratio range to ensure businesses have clients from the suburbs in the core. Consider restoring free zone to complement this to encourage downtown business viability.

Include mass transit; stop letting irresponsible builders ruin our city by building condos that don't provide parking.

If public transit modes were improved, then less parking would be needed.

I was thrilled when the disabled tag was no longer carte blanche. It's still too powerful, but we're getting there. When and where parking is too crowded, increase the price. When it is underutilized, reduce the price. Very simple. There is no sense in a standard price across the city.

Emphasis on bike parking, electric vehicle parking and charging, and park and ride for transit is imperative in today's over polluted world.

Don't take up downtown parking spaces with pop up restaurants etc.

Cost.

Charge for parking in areas like NW 23rd. And have permit only parking in places surrounding transit center instead of allowing MAX riders take all the spaces from the residents.
Better park-and-ride options within the city of Portland.

Also, have apps that tell drivers where parking spaces are available so you don't have to drive around looking. This would reduce the amount of driving and be safer than trying to drive and look at the same time.

All businesses should be required to provide adequate parking as part of the expensive of running a business.

All areas where there is more demand than spaces should be priced, with pricing varying dynamically according to demand during the day. Technology should be used (e.g. via mobile apps) to allow drivers to quickly see where parking is at what price. Parking requirements should be reduced wherever shared parking between compatible uses is possible, where there is high quality transit, and where there is available parking nearby. Parking should be priced, which would encourage developers to build paid parking garages in areas with higher need.

A small % should be spent here.

A qualified yes. You threw a ton of stuff in there. Downtown, Sellwood and NW Portland are nightmares--as well as other areas. Too many restricted parking spaces. Shake things up. Open up those truck delivery spaces during the day and only allow them to deliver at night when less need for parking in those busy areas. Park and ride is good--use it often. Times at meters are sometimes too short. I'm disabled and by the time I get to where I need to go to do my business, I have to turn around again to get back to my car.

A focus on removing the subsidized street parking we have, including metering more locations to reduce incentive to park on busy streets.

All businesses should be required to provide adequate parking as part of the expensive of running a business.

Ban apartment developers from building apartments without parking. Having tons of apartments without parking creates a hudge parking mess and it doesn't really help anything.

Cost.

Forget the ideas of generating local and state revenue. The developers are loping away with mega revenue right now. How does this work? In my neighborhood, I would like to be able to have permit parking for residents on our block -- most single-family units or multi-family units have parking provided -- so our neighborhood doesn't turn into the parking nightmare residents face if they live around NW 21st - 23rd. As for other options, how about you provide free parking for automobiles owned by seniors, handicapped people, parents with small children . . . . And charge tenants who move into buildings that don't provide parking for parking anywhere in the neighborhood.

I was thrilled when the disabled tag was no longer carte blanche. It's still too powerful, but we're getting there. When and where parking is too crowded, increase the price. When it is underutilized, reduce the price. Very simple. There is no sense in a standard price across the city.

Incentives to encourage parking garages instead of surface parking.

No free parking. No free parking. No free parking.
No net loss in downtown parking, require parking for new developments in downtown in the 1:1 ratio range to ensure businesses have clients from the suburbs in the core. Consider restoring free zone to complement this to encourage downtown business viability.

Parking policies should not be used to promote less car use/ownership.

Reduce restrictions and special designations. It wastes fuel and time looking for an open site with the right time limit.

Remember always that complicated parking restrictions are intimidating to visitors.

The safety of pedestrians, bikes, and cars.

Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 6:

1. The correct approach is to apply substantial charges to all parking to help meet our climate goals -- that's the point, remember?
2. There are fewer and fewer parking spaces and streets are crowded as it is. People will not give up their cars and with all the housing that is being built that do not provide parking the streets are only getting worse.
3. Don't the Goodmans have enough money?
4. Whether to devote any more space than absolutely necessary for parking (the answer...is no).
5. This does not alleviate emissions.
6. The cost to tax payers and the bad economy.
7. I am one of the very unhappy consumers who has to deal with Portland Parks and Recreation parking at the Oregon Zoo. Poor public relations, a detriment to the zoo, Forestry Center, Children's Museum ... :
8. While a good goal, and I support it, I think other items have a higher priority at this time.
9. Parking is already over complicated. And I simply do not trust Metro to implement anything vis a vis parking that would actually make it better.
10. If you bike or walk or transit, no parking needed.
11. But more park and ride would help.
12. Thus far I have seen nothing that makes sense. The city is allowing builders to put multi-family structures up with no parking with the city thinking that only people without vehicles will live there. So, people move in, and most have 1 or 2 cars and are then parking in the neighborhoods to the detriment of home owners.
13. Like in cities such as Washington D.C the people that get penalized the most are the people who work in the city and either have to move their cars every hour or get ticketed when the meter runs out. If I wanted live in a big city with all it's problems I would move to one.
14. Concern that adding more metered parking areas is just to create more revenue for the city and not necessarily to benefit persons living in the community. I cannot afford to pay for more metered spaces. I have a handicapped placard and concern that making all spaces metered limits my access.
15. No on street parking here.
Let the Free Market determine how the land should be used. Keep Government out of parking garages.

I don't know what is meant by "your community." If you mean Portland, then yes. If you mean where I actually live, then no.

My "no" would turn to a "yes" were there more common sense flexibility built into the policies I have seen in the past. For smaller communities, e.g. Troutdale with which I am most familiar, parking regulations handed down from above have stifled economic development in the downtown area. And, I am in general, a supporter of such guidelines. Note the wording there: guidelines. Hard and fast regulations do nothing to solve such issues.

I don't live in Portland but the thought that apartments are being built without parking associated with them is next to criminal. Most of the people will have cars and will be parking in neighborhoods that are not able to accommodate them. I live in a rural area so this is not an issue for me personally.

Does not seem like a high priority.

Parking is already ridiculously expensive. Low cost park and ride I could support.

Utilizing penalties through parking fees to force altered behaviors is probably effective, but it is certainly not my desire. When you begin eliminating my parking at the destinations of choice, I will turn to the internet and eliminate the need to go to those places...the demise of the brick and mortar system the finances our governmental structures.

Taking parking away to install bubble curbs is a waste of space for parking. If you need the slopped sidewalk create it without the bubble extending into the highway and parking space so far. We use the roads and the speed bumps in most instances are an utter waste of money.

I do not frequent down town Portland due to the need to pay for parking. I do my shopping where there is free parking.

We already have enough parking Nazis.

Studies have shown that increasing parking does NOT make urban areas more pedestrian nor bicycle friendly. Make it HARDER to park and people will finally use other forms of transportation.

Portland has spent 40 years making itself as unattractive as possible to private vehicles. Since we have not convenient bus service, I probably never visit, shop or dine in downtown Portland again. Continuing to allow "planners" to dictate parking and transit policy will result in region-wide chaos and downtown Portland gridlock.

Our city has created a parking nightmare with every new parking development. They don't want people to drive so they are reducing the size and number of allotted spaces. Lots of unhappy parkers who give up and drive off and end up not supporting our restaurants and retail.

Metro has already made their point that they want to discourage cars in Portland. There should be ample parking available for anyone who wants to drive into the city.
Let's face it: metered parking is simply a revenue source for municipalities. It could serve a useful purpose, but has become too important a source of money to them. Parking is so difficult and expensive in downtown Portland that I no longer go there. I don’t shop, don’t dine, and don’t do business in downtown Portland because the City Council no longer sees anything but dollars on the streets.

Let the parkers aka the market, figure it out. There are so many signs already they are a distraction to driving. Parking signs that indicate how much time here, how much time there, are safety hazards because drivers are spending time and attention reading signs and they’re not watching conditions. Trying to read those parking meters after dark is a joke. There is no indication whatsoever how to start the process on those meters.

I support doing all of this but do we need to spend more money on it? Aren’t we already doing this?

No, very regressive.

No, especially if it anything like what has happened policy-wise for parking along North Mississippi.

New community’s and infill are very short on parking.

My community is cutting back on parking spaces in the mis-begotten belief that people in the suburbs will walk or take transit and get rid of cars. Ha! Our town is horribly underserved by transit, its hilly (hard to walk) and spread out. It’s using a cookie cutter to design an individual community.

I think this already works well.

The city of Portland has taken this policy to ridiculous lengths, to the point that it is very difficult to park downtown, and the downtown area has become a haven for panhandlers and drug addicts. Instead of a lively and inviting downtown area, they have developed a place that makes even getting there more difficult than necessary. I refuse to even go there unless I need something immediately that I cannot obtain elsewhere. Government may envision a max train down McLoughlin all the way to Oregon City, but I believe the voters have already weighed in on that one.

Shorter parking times cost local business money because people will not shop in impacted areas. Also, more fuel is used driving around looking for a place to park.

Government planning is rarely effective or efficient in dealing with these issues. They over-require politically favored slots, such as carpool-reserved parking or bike parking slots and create unintended consequences. I would prefer co-investment through a public-private model in adding additional parking to high-need areas.

Focus should be away from cars. Other countries have done it. It can be done.

Except for planning park 'n ride facilities, this is not an field where the public sector outperforms the private sector, for that reason it is not a good use of limited public resources.

The more you invest in parking spaces, the more cars there will be to fill them. Make it difficult to drive downtown, for example, so people will have to change. We're at a point in the climate crisis where leaving it up to individuals to change is just not enough. We need a "royal" mandate.
While it is understood that parking management and cost can function as a disincentive for automobile use, it has little or no application in suburban environments.

There are no parking problems in my community. Portland is overpopulated and parking problems are to be expected.

The more I read this questionnaire, the more annoyed I get. Parking policies are the most frustrating part of living or working in this area. Artificial and part of the goal to move people into the cattle-car transportation for the sheep of Portland, dwindling supplies through increased density requirements without parking consideration has made it like lord of the flies when parking. Add in the regulation by the city with meter maids hovering like vultures, and I want to move to Bend or Boise. How about taking a break from all of the over-regulation of parking and let the dust settle a bit? See where things are before implementing broad and sweeping changes for several jurisdictions trying to be in "substantial compliance" with Metro's goals. Enough with the parking meddling. Please. We are begging you to take a break from parking issues.

Tualatin offers considerable parking except for its library.

Less parking more mass transit.

Current funding of parking should be adequate; I see no benefit of more spending here.

All you want to do is restrict parking and charge more, more, more. Many people in the metro area do NOT live in Portland and do NOT have access to Tri-Met the more you limit parking the less we drive into that city. Notice to all store owners in Portland - we will not be shopping at any of your businesses any more because you and Metro don't want us there.

Policies have reduced parking spaces while increasing living units without provisions for parking. Bad policies.

I don't believe government should be managing most parking matters. Let private industry take care of this.

Constricting parking/managing parking should be done by market demand not Metro.

We remain a vehicle-oriented culture & cities need to allow development’s to have adequate parking; changes to code would be more useful.

Parking is an important way to help reduce driving and traffic, but building multi unit dwellings in existing neighborhoods with zero parking seems too harsh.

Not necessarily for sub-urban areas. Codes could be more flexible in allowing reduced parking and in-fill where existing parking is consistently under-utilized. But I would not support anything that might result in pay to park, except maybe in Town Center parking garages.

I would not support timed and or metered parking lot. The MAX stations should have more free park-and-ride.

We waste precious parking spaces for seldom used handicapped parking. This is particularly true around newer parking lots.
Possibly depending upon a detailed policy which does not get changed.

Policies need to be fair for the largest number of people.

Park and ride for transit is the only thing I can support on this one.

Building homes, businesses or apartments without adequate parking assumes people are willing to give up their cars. NOT!!! This is a planners delusion. Let them work and live without parking and let the rest of us have parking spaces.

Let the private sector deal with it.

Let the free market work it out.

This goal primarily benefits the city of Portland, where many of us don't live or travel to very often. Always prioritize resources to focus on the greatest good for the greatest number!

Shared spaces with local businesses sounds like a fine idea provided there is enough business parking to allow them to operate normally.

I'm concerned public focus on this as an objective will encroach too much into private property use. With the exception of publicly-owned space (park-and-rides), I do not support public management of parking. Let the system bring commerce and the market drive the parking to support it.

I don't trust my "community" to make good decisions.

Free parking should be expanded. Parking spaces should be required for new apartments and condos and office buildings. Restrictions on parking should be diminished.

There are more important areas than this.

Sounds like you'll end up restricting parking spaces or moving them and making them inconvenient. Many existing park and ride lots are little used.

Generally I do not support this because you don't work very well with businesses. An administrative minority foists their well on the public. Way too many nonsensical regulations already.

Again, too much social engineering. Overuse as a revenue source is frustrating to the consumer and can often hurt businesses. Modest fees for parking is fine because it is a pay-as-you-go strategy, and isn't too high of a hurdle. Need more parking at Sunset Transit.

Not if you intend to reduce the number of parking places.

The more parking, the more people will drive instead of using public transportation or alternatives.

Seems as though that system is already in place and that the funds could be better put to use making our limited and rather exclusive mass transit system work more effectively and efficiently for all.

Now the businesses have to provide way more parking places by statute than they really need. Most centers already have lots of shared parking. I agree with parking for Park and Ride but it should be paid for by the bus and public transit system.

New development should require off street parking.
You probably mean taking parking away. I love downtown. Some of my friends don't visit because parking is limited as it is.

We should end mandatory parking minimums and charge for parking.

We need offstreet parking for new construction projects. The new apartments without parking degrade the existing neighborhoods.

Too keep a vibrant downtown, we NEED parking-more not less.

Public land (i.e. roadways) should not be used for the temporary or permanent storage of private vehicles.

Parking needs to cost money, for everyone and that especially means no free parking for the elites in government and business.

No government involvement is needed.

We are already building many buildings in the City of Portland that have no parking so this policy is in serious straights before it ever gets off the ground.

This question as phrased is too vague. Do I support managing the parking we have? Yes. Do I support forcing low and middle income people out of their cars by jacking up the cost for them to park where they need to be? No.

This doesn't seem as much of a priority to me, but surely better organization and efficiency are good things. I'm not against better use of parking resources, but compared with some of the other policies, I'd say it's less important to focus on that policy.

The ride free area should be put back in place so people can visit the most congested area (downtown) via transit from nearby areas without having to wander around downtown looking for parking to avoid a $2.50 fare each way from areas that have much more parking.

The policies applied to Division st development are terrible. Any commercial development needs to provide 100% of its own parking.

The City needs to understand that parking fees will decrease shopping to area businesses. And allowing apartment complexes to be built in neighborhoods w/o parking is not a good policy for those who live in those neighborhoods. Also the City Parking Lots ..what stores (that the City advertises that there are many) actually validate ? It is very hard to find one .

See comment re improving and widening roadways. they must become less attractive than mass transit.

It seems like Portland is already doing a good job of this. Ensuring that technology for metered parking is working is important though.

I think this is a bill of goods that will not be fulfilled!

I think mass transit must be encouraged and parking deficits are an asset.

Fewer cars solves this problem.

Efficient parking encourages the use of personal vehicles. We are trying to do the opposite!
Work to reduce the number of cars.

Provide more secure and always free parking for bicycles. Triple current fees for parking in order to fund public transit and bicycle infrastructure.

Less parking needed.

As long as city services remain fee based, the impact of additional services falls too heavily on the poor.

This should be a business-driven decision. Portland views this as a revenue issue which it then chooses not to invest in basic street repair and maintenance.

The parking policies implemented in the past have not improved parking in my neighborhood. Stop trying to improve parking, you have made it more expensive and less available. Also, allowing apartments to be built with no parking was a mistake and adds to parking problems in the neighborhood.

Let the private market determine parking.

Let the marketplace take care of this. We have too many metered parking spaces that hurt our retail economy already.

People ad businesses need parking, but there can be too much interference from government. Too many restrictions and conditions become too confusing and meaningless.

Park and ride for transit is ok, but if you just improve the bus systems you won't need it. People drive to the train because the bus systems are slow and useless. Better to spend money improving the transit system within the city.

One item of park-and-ride would be to add overnight spots to max stations making max accessible for trips to the airport or train station. As it is, if you're not on a max line, it's faster and easier to just drive yourself.

I don't think this is a very high priority, in comparison to other needs.

I do not support public money being spent to create parking with fees.

I completely support policies around making existing parking more efficient. However, I do not support building additional parking infrastructure except at Park and Ride facilities intended to encourage people to park and then use transit.

Don't spend more money so more people can drive.

Does not seem like a priority to me compared with other needs.

We need to require more parking for multi-family dwelling units. Some of the new developments have absolutely no parking, but it's a fantasy to think that most tenants will choose not to have a vehicle. This has the potential of creating a future parking nightmare which will destroy the usability of the city. We need more parking, not less.

Not a high priority for me.

More and better parking means more and more cars.
I'm resentful of the discriminatory pricing on parking meters for close-in neighborhoods. Why is it that in the neighborhood I live in metered spaces cost far more than in many other close-in neighborhoods - which makes it more costly for my guests to visit me? I pay high property taxes, and it feels as if this is another hidden location-based tax. Parking meters should cost the same no matter what neighborhood they are located in. For neighborhoods that are more crowded let's provide greater incentives for, and make it easier to develop parking structures.

Again, let's move people out of cars.

Requirements for auto parking for apartment buildings.

Parking is tough downtown and in surrounding city areas. It should be as given our population and the convenience of individual powered transport. Complex regulations are the wrong direction to spend our energy and budgets. Focus on making it 'easier' to not drive/park.

NO, I DON'T want to make efficient use of land and parking spaces? See how that works? If you phrase a question to where one answer sounds dumb, people will answer the way that doesn't sound dumb...which is exactly what you want. I hope your little organization goes belly up, just like the CRC.

Leave parking alone. Can't find a place to park? Go somewhere else.

It's already one in the core of the metro area & will expand to areas need because of neighborhood associations & business needs - they will let us know so we don't need to over "study/fund" this bureaucracy. However no multi-use/unit building should be build without a parking space provided for each unit/shop! No matter where at in metro area.

If anything, the amount of parking should be decreased. Making parking less convenient will incentivize other forms of transit and also allow the city to remove road space currently used to park cars saving on maintenance costs in the long run.

I think parking at home should be easier than parking at a destination within the city, meaning that I should give a second thought to how difficult it will be to park my car at my destination. If it is too difficult to park my car and some other form of transportation is better than I will not drive. Too much parking makes it too easy to drive. As long as there are viable and effective alternatives, I say focus on filling Portland with people rather than cars.

I abhor Portland's policy toward apartment and other development that does not require at least 70% as part of the project. I appreciate the idea that no parking might, but only if smoke funny smelling weed, means that residents will take public transport or walk. Cars, for better or worse, are here to stay and believing that they can be controlled by not providing parking is just plain silly!

This should be done with revenues collected from those sources, not tax or grant funding.

PDX needs to stop authorizing condos/apartments with no on-site parking.

Parking is too cheap in the central city.
Parking is too cheap and available here..... REALLY.... we need to charge more, increase parking prices for events. We need to use parking as an income generator. Even the way this question is asked shows the bias of Metro. If we are serious about climate solutions we must do the difficult.

Parking is currently priced too low. Costs of parking should better reflect the societal expense of allowing automobiles to occupy so much public space.

Parking incentivizes sprawl, single occupancy vehicles, and is essentially a subsidy to drive.

Only for business visitors, not commuters. Spend money on fast reliable transit. Street cars are neither.

Money better Spent in public transit and bike lanes.

If it is harder or more expensive to park less people will drive and more people will use transit- the only exception should be enough park and ride options to encourage more transit use.

Manage parking seems to be code for "make it harder for people to do business."

You are really proposing making parking more expensive. The real solution to parking is less density - there is no parking problem in low density areas.

This is a hot-button issue and it is not working well. Needs to be reconsidered in light of neighborhood issues. It is unwise to try to force people to use mass transit by removing parking, charging for it on residential streets, or allowing multiple dwelling units to be built without off-street parking. Tread carefully.

This appears to be a lot of wasted planning time and producing results that are detrimental to neighborhood parking, which Portland especially is ruining. Portland planners have the attitude that we have to rid ourselves of the attitude that we neighbors have a right to park near our homes. Guess what - with the high property taxes we pay, WE DO!

There is no shortage of land!! Do you guys ever look down when in an airplane? The only places with parking problems is expensive, congested high density areas that should be allowed to naturally wither away instead of being subsidized by non users. Particularly obsolete downtowns.

Thank you for working to prevent the abuse of handicapped parking placards for free parking downtown.

Require parking for new housing construction and pretty much otherwise stay out of it. Portland's efforts re parking meters is only to raise more money for itself - what a surprise.

Policies in the past have been that stores and shopping centers must provide parking. This is counter-productive. An incentive to use alternative transportation would be that it's hard and expensive to park a car. Aside from encouraging people to drive, parking lots are a poor use of land.

Parking should be hard to find and expensive unless the user is disabled. Parking is the absolute most wasteful use of public and private space and building parking lots should be discouraged. Parking minimums should be kept as small as possible as well. We will only reach our climate goals by making driving a less appealing (and hopefully completely unappealing!) endeavor.

Not sure how this helps the objectives identified up front.
Making parking easier means more will drive cars. Not an optimum solution.

I think the City is failing us in this area. High density housing is being built without providing adequate spaces for tenant parking. Construction of these structures are causing unneeded interference in traffic flow currently and with the occupants most likely to have cars and no available parking space residential neighborhoods and communities are going to be impacted.

I support this in the context of Park & Ride to increase opportunities for public transit and carpool use.

I can't see this ever winning public support...is this across the region or in specific areas?

When I have to park the options are horrible, garages are congested, prone to accidents, overfilled, meters are varied on times and are watched militantly by meter readers who write 40$ tickets when you are minutes late getting back....not sure what the solution is but parking in portland is bad.

Sounds like too much cost and effort, other priorities are higher.

Providing park and ride facilities, especially in structures, should be avoided. It encourages auto dependency. Providing frequent bus service connected to light rail is a better alternative.

Not that I totally don't support this, but not the priority.

No because current parking enforcement is predatory.

How to manage space fairly without excessive expense on the part of taxpayers (in other words, the generation of revenues should be more of a side effect than a goal); money people don't have to spend on parking can be spent on more economically generative ventures like businesses (rather than more bureaucracy).

Get people out of cars.

Forget it! The region needs more parking spaces both off and on street for people to park their cars when not in use. 72 percent of the occupied units in the apartment houses without parking in Portland have one or more cars. Eight to ten percent of the jobs in the US are tied to the auto industry - most of them family wage jobs. While a bicycle mechanic makes $27,000 per year, and auto mechanic makes $40,000 to $50,000 a year. Moreover, the more mobile society is, the more vibrant the economy becomes.

Absolutely not. All these new apartments without parking and the policies that reduce or limit parking are choaking our streets and roadways. We need more parking not less for the population explosion Metro predicts. If Metro wants to play with incentives, then use them to reduce population growth, the real culprit creating climate change.

We don't need more parking meters, which obviously is where you're headed with this.

Require apartments to provide parking spaces. Current city of portland policy is just crazy. Even people who live transit and bike oriented lives often want to own a car.

Provide more parking for bikes and less parking for businesses.
163 97214 Prioritize public and active transportation over amenities for automobiles.
164 97214 Parking encourages the use of cars. eliminate parking and you get rid of cars walk, bike, or take the bus Do not fund the use of cars or the use of fossil fuels by providing more parking.
165 97214 Make walking, biking, bus riding easier - keep parking difficult and expensive.
166 97214 Inconvenient parking incentivizes me to take mass transit or ride my bike more often. Help more people make choices that are better for the environment and their health by not making it easier to drive in congested area.
167 97214 If we expand parking, we should use existing parking land to build a garage up instead of adding new land for parking.
168 97214 I think that free parking is vital to maintaining the economic viability of shopping/business districts. One of the reasons that downtown Portland is a vital, busy place is that drivers of cars know that they can find parking more or less easily. I would vigorously oppose any effort to reduce parking or to make it more difficult. Donald Shoup can go fly a kite.
169 97214 I think parking solutions are the least part of the problem of having too many people living in places that force them to drive.
170 97214 How 'bout not letting developers build crappy apt. bldgs. with no parking that existing residents HATE?
171 97215 Parking should be available at reasonable cost.
172 97215 Parking meters are the worst invention in the world. It's another way to get working people to subsidize what the politicians have been unwilling to wrangle from their corporate coffers. Again, we wouldn't be in this mess if you people had the hindsight to force the mega apartment builders and the corporate multiplexes to create infrastructure (i.e. preparing inventories, assess parking needs, provide space for their tenants, etc.).
173 97215 Limit free parking; eliminate any subsidized parking except for elderly/disabled.
174 97215 I'm in favor of providing less parking, as long as jobs can move closer to homes and people can walk or bike or take transit.
175 97215 I think there are already enough restrictions and parking ticket people.
176 97215 How about just mandating that businesses make their lots available to the public when they're closed?
177 97215 Free public parking with time limits should considered.
178 97215 Empirical observation of implementation of these policies leads me to conclude that they are punitive to the working class and lower middle class, and rewarding mostly to large wealth developers. Stop doing this.
179 97216 I would like to see Portland MANAGE what they have, honestly.
180 97216 I think we do this well already.
181 97217 There should be more parking available.
182 97217 There is a push to build housing density with inadequate parking and then to charge people to park in their own neighborhood. This needs review.
Shame on whoever gave permits to build condos and apartment buildings without parking spaces. What a ridiculous notion! Even most bike commuters have a car. Foolish law.

Right now, parking in this city is a money making endeavor and that is it. Costs outweigh benefits. Sometimes a person has to go to something that isn't offered anywhere else, such as the courts downtown, or other services only available downtown, but the cost of parking there, plus the cost of tickets, is ridiculous. There are no disincentives to those writing tickets not to do so erroneously. Those stupid machines that print out tickets are annoying and difficult to use, and the little passes they print fall out of windows. I've gotten a ticket for $80 when I purchased a pass that fell on my seat, and I didn't get a refund. What incentive is there to do things right? This kind of thing makes me want to never visit downtown except in when absolutely necessary. Plus it makes people pay for spots twice or more. I pay, then leave earlier than expected, and the next person or the next has to buy another ticket. I hate money making, greedy schemes like these that are not environmentally friendly and trying to sell them as such is disingenuous.

Portland is doing everything in its power to remove parking from our buildings and our streets. This is a money grab at tax payer expense. Try thinking about the tax payer.

Parking has become big business for cities. Too often, parking policies, while beneficial for short-time relief for some, have unintended consequences affecting residents/neighbors/business over a longer time frame.

I think focusing on parking sends the message that it's okay to drive cars everywhere. I would like to see more focus on giving alternative transportation options!

Again, discouraging driving through making parking difficult is a good strategy.

We already have parking problems. Parking is not nearly as convenient as it has been in the past. In fact it is down right impossible downtown. There is so much abuse already and I just don't see this working without public supervision. But again, I know you don't care and already have a plan approved regardless of public input.

Want to see more specific details—do not trust that citizens are listened to with the same attention as developers. Tax payers are given many promises (affordable housing in S Waterfront and other areas) but rarely are these enforced.

This sounds like a dishonest attempt to garner support for starving us of parking. A parking version of the ill-conceived "road diets".

This makes no sense at all. There are Much better ways to budget your money.

The apartments with no parking in SE Portland is the best example of why I do not support anything that the city will come up with.
People need to quit driving so long as there are other options!

Parking policy is a shambles and discourages us from using downtown Portland and the parks. Isn’t the community to be welcomed? Policies to make parking much easier should be emphasized.

Not until all streets are paved. And when that happens, the first parking change should be free parking downtown to encourage people to go there to shop rather than going to the burbs.

Not sure this is the most effective use of resources compared to the other policies.

Need more parking, sunset transit center surrounded by empty fields would be a good place to start.

Make parking expensive!! Our culture is not benefiting from building everything to accommodate cars. Americans are spoiled and need to be weaned from driving for every little trip.

Lower priority.

Less parking means car use is less convenient.

In some areas, parking issues do need to be addressed - Portland "planners" currently seem to believe that building apartment bunkers with no parking makes sense. I believe that they’re simply making matters worse.

I’m almost sure if this was worded in a way that was not intended to obscure the actual plans, that I would oppose it.

I support making efficient use of what is already available, sharing parking between businesses and providing park-and-rides, but not creating more parking if it destroys habitat and creates more impermeable surfaces.

I do not trust the City of Portland to develop a wise parking plan. I do support doing this...I just do not believe the city will do it. Letting thousands of apartment units be built without adequate parking is just nuts. Sure, some people will bike or use public transportation...but many other will not, creating streets so full of parked cars on the eastside that traffic is reduced to one lane. And parking in downtown should be free on weekends. On weekdays, it is difficult to find a place to park. On weekends (during the day) it is quite easy. Why? Because people go elsewhere, suburbs and other parts of Portland, to shop where they don’t have to worry about feeding the meter.

Cut down on parking spaces would increase the likelihood that people would use mass transit to get places in the city.

Quit making things so complicated. Provide more parking.

Parking prices are already prohibitive and I don’t want to see more land developed.

Parking issues are fine, unless you live very close to a busy commercial area which I do not. I am willing to pay for parking downtown (East and Westside) and in other high-use areas of Portland. However, I do support continuing to have some free, limited-time parking in NW Portland (2-hour zones, etc.).

Park and ride for transit is important. And better transit to where people work, shop and live is the next step.
If you are talking about downtown, that would kind of go against trying to get more people to use public transportation, if the people that use or need the extra space to park maybe they should pay for it!

I think it is counterproductive to encourage people to come in the inner city by car. I dont believe in free parking or subsidizing our roads for cars. Ban cars no need to park the death devices.

Market demand.

I would except that due to high density zoning that was pushed in downtown core areas, the problem was compounded and now those living there or visitors to these are paying the price. The meter system in Portland is terrible to use if you don't have enough change or a credit card available, but you do have paper money you could use but there is no way to do so. Also, the fee charged for being a few minutes past is outrageous. If you can park for an hour for $1.60, then are 1 minute past that fee is $39.00...what??? Who figured out that percentage? Also, more flexibility in time/cost for meters around the city parks that are used needs to be addressed. Due to exorbitant overage fees for parking meters, people are getting discouraged to want to use them, or visit friends in areas of NW or around upper downtown areas. I have observed same in areas of Hillsboro, Milwaukee, and Lake Oswego downtown core though have to say Hillsboro is actually more flexible. Planners need to consider that one can't take the Max or bus, or ride a bike if they are supposed to bring a fold up table, or other big items to these type of destinations so they need to rely on affordable, accessible parking. Outrageous fees or gouging for over limit should be amended to percentage based on minutes and some of the overzealous meter bike/maids

Possibly provide more park and ride areas but with expanded bus service less of this would be needed. Parking meters deter business.

Portland shoud not allow the apartment bunkers with no parking as well.

Not unless you have taken robocars into account which can self-park in a variety of locations and be called with a cell phone. Such a transition would be very helpful to everyone - except conventional parking businesses.

Metered parking in public parks is unacceptable.

I don't see a parking problem.

Free parking is a must.

Parking management refers to various policies and programs implemented through city and county development codes" "Reduces costs to governments, businesses, developers and consumers" How? There is a cost to develop codes, and enforce codes, and Portland can't control tow truck drivers. Parking for bicyclists is free (but a cost to taxpayers to develop/maintain), but not for persons who carpool.

We have bigger issues to tackle.

Until there are better public transit options, metro cannot restrict the number of parking spaces for businesses near Max stations. My commute takes 15 min by car, 35 min by bike, and 76 min using public transportation.
This is a stupid question. Of course it's up to the municipality to manage parking.

This is a local concern not a Metro regional concern. I don't want a disinterested Metro Council (who does not live nor partake in my community in Tigard) telling me how I can park in Tigard - unless Metro's Council is willing to accept me dictating the terms of how they get around. How many of them consistently use transit to Metro meetings, when Metro provides them with a nice parking garage attached to Metro's HQ? I've never seen my Metro Councilor on my bus.

Sounds like code for higher cost parking, and for removing parking. Do you think we are all stupid? Put in more parking. There actually is plenty of land for this - people may just have to walk farther from their cars.

Provide bike park and rides and safe bike/pedestrian routes to transit instead.

Private sector, not government business.

Nothing should be considered. Government is incapable of managing something of this scale.

In areas such as NE Fremont, SE Hawthorne Blvd, and SE Belmont, we really need to have a special area for public parking...free. The reason is because residents are unable to park on the side of the street in front of their homes in these popular shopping and dining areas.

I don't think this is a high priority for public dollars. Let the market - and the drivers hunting for spaces - work it out.

This seems too close to social engineering. Driving should remain a viable option.

Stop trying to eliminate cars and transfer wealth...let the market dictate.

Let the market decide...stop turning downtown parking into streetside cafe seating.

Let market forces rule...this is just more giveaways at the cost to the actual taxpayer.

Just trying to force us out of cars and that should be illegal...it is a free country why should the government try to force us out of cars.

Get out of the way and let private land owners, developers, etc. figure out and pay for the parking they believe their customers need. If they get it wrong, they pay the cost, not taxpayers.

Encourages private trans.

This is pretty much a lost cause. There should be rules for providing parking and then better options so people don't have to drive as stated in #1.

Only if it means more or less expensive parking.

Let private sector take lead here. You cannot social engineer people out of a car.

It's better to make parking a difficulty and public transport & active transport more attractive so people will choose the latter over using private cars.
I do not drive, so I have no comment on this matter except for when apartments are being built with no parking - that is not
ok as people still need to use vehicles for shopping and travel and drivers I know do not want to pay for parking - so they find
spaces that there is no fee and take up those spaces which should be either turning over more frequently or left vacant for
those who live in the neighborhood.

You all lost me when you started charging parking fees to use city parks.. Thats is just mean and cruel to the poor, young
families and the elderly... boo on you!

This is a policy driven by anti-vehicle opinions. Sure, make parking a profitable venture then get the government out of the
way. Allow business to do what it does best; operate systems at a profit. Perhaps, parking is the development that will
generate local and state revenue. It will surly complete or complement the existing industries, if given the chance.

This is a disguise to make war on drivers.

This investment should be made by developers. More SDC's and requirements placed on developers.

This has been done to death as well in the past and simply does NOT work because the real time needs NEVER match what is
available so bureaucracy fails every time (i.e., this is NOT realistic in the real world).

There is not enough parking in Portland. Businesses,would do better if there were more parking. We are thinking of
dropping our zoo and Japanese garden memberships because of the charge for parking.

The City of Portland has parking facilities. They are the only money making thing they do.

Rather than building more parking provisions, we should be eliminating the need for parking. We need to reduce
environmental pollution and address climate change. Figure out more efficient ways to move people that having them get in
their cars in the first place.

Planners tend to force making parking spaces too small and codes require tree islands and other pretty stuff that takes up
scarce parking space. And parking should not be yet another excuse for local government to reach into my pocket with
meters (and tickets for accidental overtime).

Other than at Sunset transit center, I've never found parking to be an issue. I would expand parking at the transit center for
commuters by BUILDING MORE PARKING not by restricting current parking. The location does not lend itself to getting there
by any means other than a car.

No. You want to restrict cars. All this is a front.

Making parking more convenient will lead to MORE individual travel, not less.

Let the free market do this. Government just wastes money.

It sounds good but not if its going to just make parking more expensive and hard to come by.

Incentivise private projects.

I don't think this topic is important compared to others.

Enough regulations already.
Parking is already over managed by government, helping to strangle business in metropolitan areas of Oregon.

Let supply and demand take care of the problem. Keep government out of it. Just another way to waste resources and provide jobs to the expanding government employee base. It's just more government interference in our lives. I get the impression you will dictate when and how long I can go on a trip and how long I can use a parking facility.

I think that the market should decide these factors. Let people build parking garages (business and developers have been denied), and it will take care of itself. The thing with parking is, if you don't have it near where you want people to go (shopping, sports, dining), they end up going somewhere else to do those activities that has parking.

Current management of parking is extremely frustrating and only makes people want to avoid places where parking has been limited and taxed. Portland is becoming known regionally as a really crappy place to find parking. Please stop "managing" our parking.

I resent the city of Portland going to the expense and greed of putting in parking meters everywhere. It is a fleecing of Portland's citizens.

No. sounds like make-work.

No more meters. Require parking for all residential development and all restaurants. Any office or mixed multiple housing needs off street parking as a requirement. Look to our neighbors to the North, Vancouver BC require off street parking included even with home remodels.

The planning that has already been done in this area is anything but effective, and quite expensive.

We need investment in parking, more not less!

There is too much emphasis on poorly managed parking meters already.

This is too general for me to understand what is involved.

This can be assisted by private entities.

The explanation implies that there will be a reduction in parking spaces. I do not support new construction, especially residential construction, that provides no parking for tenants. Policymakers need to provide appropriate parking availability with new construction, yet an inventory of existing parking may be necessary.

Parking management is a necessity. However, I have seen it mis-used as often as well-used. So my trust level is low and it is difficult to give a Yes or No to unknown policies. For example: parking availability and costs can be used as incentives for human-scaled biking and walking solutions. Yet, the current policy of allowing apartment construction without any parking facilities is completely unrealistic and only causing future problems and expense.
I wanted to answer, 'sort of'-- i was on the beaverton city council when washington square was approved with minimal parking--the theory was that people would take buses to get there--DID NOT WORK. They ended up building tons of additional parking instead.

Actually, I think the phrasing of this question is unclear. Would I like parking issues to be better managed? Yes. Do I think local policies are currently managing parking well? No. Creating partnerships so lots can be shared by users who need them at different times is helpful (Providence Park event parking in local church lots is potentially helpful, that sort of thing). Believing people will not own cars if you make it hard for them to park them is wishful thinking, not good policy. We have a good public transport system, but we do not have a perfect public transport system. At least 80% of the time it would be faster (and dryer) for me to go somewhere by car than by transit. Apartment complexes need to have at least one parking space per unit built into them. I live across the street from a set of row houses which have garage space for one car and driveway space for a second car but are occupied by families with at least four cars per household, and some of those households include members of the trucking industry who park their big rig cabs in what is currently an undeveloped adjacent lot. When that lot is developed (expected as soon as next year) all those truck cabs and additional cars will end up parked on the street, which is already crowded with overflow parking from a nearby apartment complex and a thriving small business (with its own story of

We have more urgent priorities on our money: curbs, sidewalks, well-maintained roads, and lighting on McLoughlin Blvd.

The plans that are usually implemented stem from a desire to raise revenue for bureau building.. secondary goal is actually solving a problem. Not enough time to go into detail here.

Other than building more parking garages, there is no realistic, affordable way to create more parking spaces.

I will not support this unless Fareless Square is implemented.

I am not confident nor hopeful that government can do this. Just look at the city of Portland! I --WOULD-- support more city-sponsored "Smart Park" parking structures, however. I do not like to park in private lots.

Concentrate on mass transit. Local government in Portland has really messed up parking.

There is already too much bureaucracy in parking restrictions. It makes it hard on businesses when it is difficult to park.

Stop trying to cram enough people into Mult. county to overwhelm the rest of the state and dominate the political system forever.

Parking needs to be less regulated and messed with, frankly, and most parking meters need to be removed.

You are driving customers out of the business district.

Too much time and money is being spent on government micro managing everything. Let businesses determine on their own how many parking spaces they need.

Throwing more money at it won't fix a broken transit system that does not meet people's needs.
One of the factors as to why Oregon's economy lags behind the national average is because of the politically induced anti-automobile environment. Not providing adequate residential off-street parking or commercial parking negatively impacts the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. Encouraging lower rates of car ownership hurts the economy. A reality check is needed by requiring a sufficient off-street for all new residential development - including on civic corridors like Sandy Boulevard, in town centers like Hollywood and around transit stations. People are going to continue to own cars and they need places to park them both on and off the street even if they regularly use alternative transport or even part of the time.

GET REAL METRO!

Not till transit is better.
Not a priority.
Lack of adequate parking should be used as a disincentive to driving. Parking efficiency should be approved only by reducing care ownership and use.
Just let us park our cars, please.
I think parking is basically a private sector market based issue.
Don't generate revenue (taxes) from parking. We already pay too much in taxes and fees.
Disregard the whining of the Bike Portland crowd and accept the need for parking lots. Reject Shoup.
Current policies have reduced available parking and increased costs dramatically.
Because they don't ever provide enough.
Create more parking structures! People shouldn't have to give up the liberty of their car.
Not a priority.
Not till transit is better.
People should make it a priority to drive less.
Throwing more money at it won't fix a broken transit system that does not meet people's needs.
Too much time and money is being spent on government micro managing everything. Let businesses determine on their own how many parking spaces they need.
We need more, not less parking. And less fees. BOO FEES!
We waste so much-needed parking spaces with little-used handicapped parking.

Yes or no not declared or zip code not provided
1 97004 Making parking difficult and expensive is hard on out of town visitors to Portland.
2 97005 No meters in washington cournty end the zoo meters during the week-only enforce them on weekends and holidays.
3 97006 I don't know about "policies." That word scares me when put into the hands of bureaucrats. Please! Just provide more parking, especially downtown. Finding parking in Portland is a nightmare, around businesses and the university, and even where people live.
Can these ideas really be implemented or is going to be a flagrant disregard/tow truck business development/parking ticket revenue stream sort of waste? Do we really need to micromanage people’s actions in such detail?

We need less parking or have it more market driven and less subsidized.

Large metro areas need to simply be car-free and electric transit provided.

It depends upon what is being proposed. This question does not clarify. My preference is for less density but more parking spaces. Current Metro Policy is off base.

Government has no business running parking structures. It should sell off all parking structure assets.

Don’t know about this.

Really not sure about this. I am not crazy about how Portland minimizes parking in medium to high-density development. I would select "don't know" above if that option was available.

Emphasize incentives, i.e. Convenient, free bicycle parking at large events to encourage people to bike rather than drive cars or trucks causing traffic jams. The Boston Red Sox does this to ease congestion on game days. Volunteer bike parking valets get free tickets to the game. win-win!

While I support effective parking management, I disagree with the city's current policy to charge for parking in parks (e.g. Washington Park). This tends to restrict access to parks by people from different areas of the city, economic backgrounds, etc.

The default response to anyone complaining about lack of parking, or trying to block parking removal, should be to price parking in that area, either via area permits or meters.

Provide more free parking, maintain on street parking, REQUIRE ALL new housing developments to include off street parking.

Like many such ideas what does it really mean? I don’t work downtown but have frequent meetings there. Mass transit works well if my meeting is near rush hour times but is mostly useless to me if any other time of day (most often).

Consolidate land at the rear of commercial ribbons & nodes for designated off-street parking.

Parking Cash out particular with larger companies. Also Metro/State should get more involved with local parking decisions that will have significant impact on regional traffic (e.g. 6000 new parking spots at Intel) particularly if State tax breaks are being given.

More parking at transit stations.

Not sure how I really think/feel about this one.

Input from residents and business owners of the affected areas.

I think there is an abuse of parking meters by the region, sometimes in areas where there are no alternatives and I will go to a store where there is free parking vs paid. this also includes the Expo Center.
I'd love to see bus service expanded. I live ten minutes from work by car, but it takes almost an hour to get to and from work by bus (that includes a ten minute walk each way to and from the bus). Parking needs to be available for downtown events so it people don't give up on going there. And a neighborhood's street parking can't be overwhelmed and eaten up by a new building without parking.

I don't know enough about parking policy to comment on this. I know Portland purposely limited parking downtown initially to encourage bus use. Did it work? I know a lot of people were frustrated by the parking gap. I hope that there isn't a need to make driving/parking suck just to encourage walking/cycling. Driving/parking has to be part of the equation, just not ALL of the equation. If walking/cycling get a fair amount of resources, we'll see a big change in habits.

Neighborhood input is important when making decisions about parking. That means those who live there.

How low income users can be supported.

Open parking more with access to transit. Right now transit parking is largely unavailable to many even when transit covers their areas. This forces car travel excesses. Funding must not be regressive.

I really don't know enough about how this would work. There is no parking downtown any more which is sad since it takes me 90 minutes ride and a 10 minute walk to get to all that transit we are trying to encourage.

More park and ride.

I feel that metered parking should always be available to the public not just specific businesses or certain uses. I know we need specific loading and unloading zones. Park and rides should be available for free. If I'm paying to take the bus I don't want to have to pay twice. Portland has some infrastructure that goes underground are parking structures being built to utilize going underground as well as up? Is that safe when we have so many fault lines here? For me park and ride is an option but I hesitate to use the gateway transit park and ride area because of hearing about safety concerns. I know that TriMet is aware of the safety issue but that is a factor in using transit.

There are only key areas where parking really is a problem.

Sorry, I am stopping here. The survey questions are too broad to be relevant.

How to prevent selfish people from gaming parking restrictions to hog space.

Are there alternatives to parking Make parking available for bikes, motorcycles, etc not just cars.

This is not a simple yes or no... I go downtown infrequently due to the cost of parking and the hassle of parking after finally finding a spot on the street.... As a senior citizen, I would like to be able to park at a reasonable price and not have to drive around and around seeking a place..especially if I may be more that an hour or two...and risk a parking ticket.

There are very few wheelchair accessible parking places in Portland. We cannot go to most businesses because there is no way to access them due to lack of accessible parking spaces.
Not sure. The parking ticket fine is way too high—the punishment should fit the crime. My 86 year old mother paid for parking but failed to wedge it sufficiently in the window seal (arthritis issues). The meter checker saw the paid and unexpired parking stuff on the car seat, where it had fallen, and still ticketed my mom for some huge amount. The current system is bad for elderly/arthritis, semi-disabled people and those with cars with too-tight or too-loose window seals. Why can we put the stubs on the dash board on the sidewalk side as an option. Draconian mean policy.

Do not expand parking.

Effects on lower priced housing.
7. Do you support more investment by your community and our region in the maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure and new improvements to accommodate a growing region?

Respondents who answered 'YES' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7236</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9702</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9722</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9730</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97003</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you build it, they will drive it.

Implement a sales tax to make up for lost gas tax revenue. Increase gas taxes to more accurately encompass the cost of driving, while acting as an incentive to find alternative means of transportation.

Avoiding an emphasis on car infrastructure.

Yes, if the money is spent to get us away from our ridiculous freeway/gridlock culture. There has to be a better way, and several urban planners have given us alternatives to the current programs. See "The Carbon Efficient City," by A. P. Hurd, for one example, or "Abundance," by Peter Diamandis for another.

Although I first think we should fix and maintain what we already have.

Better use of large through-put traffic flows i.e. non-freeway major thoroughfares.

Maintain the roads we have built, and fund improvements that help traffic to flow smoothly.

Cars and buses are the highest priority, as is being fiscally responsible. No more expensive mass transit pet projects.

Cost. Environmental Impact. It is difficult to imagine how you can build enough infrastructure to accommodate a region growing as fast as this one.

We need to maintain what we have....figure out a way to use technology to maybe do more (keep flow moving better) with what we already have. Try to encourage employers to settle where people live.

Please consider cars.

Investment in existing infrastructure--i'm not enthusiastic about building new roads, especially since we can't keep up with the maintenance on the ones we have. i don't think we should plan on the fed giving us back much of what we send in taxes. i think we must improve our public transit so that people are willing to use it. max works pretty well, buses--way less convenient.

So work on changing the gas tax to be indexed to inflation and be increased substantially.

Reasonable expenditures with check and balances so they are reviewed by an independent panel to make sure money is being spent correctly and wisely.

Never trust the federal govt to follow thru. better to find other funding. i like our east-west train system, but the bus connections are not so good. if i use transit to go to work, i spend about 3 and 1/2 hours a day on the trip. that is too much for most people to manage. better bus service could cut that down.

The entire west side has gotten the short shrift on transportation infrastructure, along with sections of NE Portland which are shamefully without pavement or sidewalks. As such, all of the other areas within the Metro area need to be placed behind those two ignored areas, in terms of priorities.

Yes, it will take a lot of money since there's a lot missing for pedestrians and cyclists. Increase the price for gasoline and use that extra income. Do not increase property taxes since that will also put pressure on the people who are already car-less and use alternative transportation.
Where people work and how they travel to get to their work. Various modes of transportation for shopping, going from one place to another.

Maintenance is vital, that’s clear. However, “new improvements” is too vague for me to endorse. If you mean improving public transportation, sidewalks, and bike lanes, then yes. If you mean more roads and parking, then I’d say to keep in mind that the beauty of our region is one of the main reasons we love it here. Highways and parking lots take away from that beauty.

US Hwy 26 needs to be widened in the area west of the vista ridge tunnel.

So raise the gas tax. It is time too!

Smart Transportation Investment is key critical. Our surface system needs maintenance, repair, upgrade, Seismic retrofit and most all more lane capacity.

Availability to the greatest number of end users, cost, and environmental impact.

The money for that investment needs to be obtained from other than residential county property taxes or fees/taxes that hit financially overburden middle & lower income brackets.

As long as those improvements are farsighted, low emissions impact and readily available to all income levels...we cannot leave the poor behind. The concept of a growing region is going to be BIG as the climate refugee situation from California begins, then escalates---their water is not coming back, this is the new, and deteriorating, normal in a rapidly heating world.

Safety.

If we want to grow.

Maintenance first before any mass transit. Upgrade to road infrastructure before mass transit.

Any plan requires funding for implementation and operation. Infrastructure funding should not come at the expense of slowing progress and the public's migration to EV's and high efficiency vehicles just because these options impact traditional road tax revenues.

We must maintain/upgrade our current infrastructure to address future needs.

Adequate maintenance of existing infrastructure should be the top priority - it does no good to expand and improve if you cannot protect what you already have.

There has to be a balance between building transportation infrastructure and enabling people/businesses to grow. There are no easy answers.

Great idea, but you just explained that revenues from traditional sources are drying up. What gets taxed or tapped to pay for it?

Need to figure out how to index the gas tax to total gallons of gas sold in the state so that as less gas is sold due to less miles driven and more efficient cars, the revenue stays the same. That is, if 10% less gas is sold, then the tax has to go up 10%. Adjust every biennium.

Electric vehicles are coming. We must plan the infrastructure.
I am in favor of maintaining structures but don't really want to see population expansion.

Fix hwy 217 congestion.

Without raising taxes by full disclosure to the people as to what (and from where) what is coming in and what and where it is going.

I'm voting for the fee increase in Washington county, but I don't want to see extra taxes for city and county and state, and registration fees, and gas fees and user fees.

The gas taxes need to be significantly higher, and indexed to the cost of repairing the infrastructure.

I understand the underlying problem. We clearly need a new funding structure--and ideally it would fall heaviest on the heaviest users--probably involving both mileage and weight considerations--and emissions as well.

Either a carbon tax or taxation based on miles driven. Gas tax isn't working well.

Again, concern for taxing residents out of Beaverton and Washington County... I cannot absorb more property taxes.

Improve existing roads with the help of licensing and insuring bikes.

Add lanes to 217 and 26. Don't shrink highways by ending lanes. People will drive. Keeping them moving as fast as possible is more efficient and reduces toxic exhaust.

While funding is important, you must ensure that the cost is not being placed on a small minority of people.

Without raising taxes.

Nothing will happen without the $ to make it happen.

Fairness.

New improvements should not include new infrastructure. That should fall in a totally separate category, and take lower priority than maintaining and improving what we have.

Spend tax dollars on roads, like the majority or people in the entire area want, stop Portland from being so anti-car.

Yes I support more investment, but where is the money going to come from? I would be willing to pay new fees if they are not exorbitant. Keep in mind that my threshold for what is too much is probably a lot lower than what jurisdictions want or need.

Need to do seismic upgrades and retrofits high priority.

Please adopt a carbon tax with a partial offset of income taxes. It should be revenue positive.

Environment.

We simply must support our transportation infrastructure to support business, community connections...etc.

Studies of how current transportation is utilized and how to make improvements that will better facilitate transportation to specific regions.

You need to expand the routes that are offered.
97023 Yes Your suggestions are good.
97024 Yes Balancing the financing for the systems so that all modes both pay and receive benefit from financed facilities.
97024 Yes Make our roads with more lanes and use the monies that were set aside for roads on the roads not on blue or green lines on the road for bicycles to sit and wait. If a bicycle is on the road those wasted dollars spent will not help us see them. Teach pedestrians to cross at sidewalks not run out into oncoming traffic.
97027 Yes, BUT I think that dollars that should have been going to this have been diverted for other uses so I am hesitant to say Yes.
97030 Yes But minimize new or expanded roads.
97030 Yes Careful planning. Keeping costs down.
97030 Yes Unknown until we know where current money is spent.
97030 Yes The MAX is awesome as well as all Metro. Constant maintenance is essential.
97030 Yes Responsible planning is huge. we don't need another CRC fiasco (WA state politicians should have been onboard before this was even made public).
97030 Yes Make Portland and other Metro cities compact and connected by bikeways, transit, and intercity trains.
97030 Yes A scheduled maintenance program for all existing infrastructure is a must. Updating trans programs to take advantage of new technology is also a must.
97034 Yes Since I have supported all the other questions up to this point, it is essential we have adequate funding or this becomes a futile exercise.
97034 Yes Who pays for what and how much. User taxes are the least efficient and may penalize those who may not have the ability to choose their options or have many options available. Resources must come from the broad community as a whole.
97034 Yes This is where the bucks should be spent. Our neglected arterials can be upgraded and improved significantly.
97034 Yes We really have no choice. However, vying for resources within the overall existing city, county, state and federal resources should be required. Special votes for bonds or monies to "improve...this or that" is ridiculous!
97034 Yes Yes, build more roads.
97034 Yes It would be ideal to find an equitable way to fund transportation without raising taxes. But that might have to be done.
97034 Yes As long as the riders and users of the services are paying their share of the costs as well. Also, look for efficiencies from the providers of those mass transit services by cutting their costs and operating a competent organization.
97034 Yes Make public transit options more widely available in suburban areas so it is practical for more people to use it.
So long as we talk about roads, motor cars, bikes, buses and walkers, I am in full support. Just don't spend any more money on rail. It is a dead flat solid money loser and all further expansion of the system should be abandoned.

Population growth projections, realistic need.
I support maintenance of existing infrastructure but no new taxes to do so. Revenue should come from re-prioritizing existing funds.
Funding for rail should be a high priority as a long term investment.
Price, on a per mile basis, the cost of using roads based on true costs, including the cost of capacity increases in crowded urban areas. If prices are set right, this will provide exactly enough (but not more) revenue to keep up with demand. Don't put another cent into 19th century technology (rails).
If new/wider roads are needed, be sure to incorporate bike/ped lanes in the planning. Consider adding special bike signals in areas of high conflict between bikes/cars.
A livable Metro area is dependent on sound transportation.
Absolutely. Autos are by far the choice of most to get around. Give us what we want and pay taxes for. Social engineering is insulting.
Pay attention to the reasonableness of the money requests and you will be fine.
Need to provide new highways before growth gets so dense that building the highways is prohibited.
This one is going to require a serious educational campaign. People need to understand why we all need to chip in more.
We wouldn't be in such poor situations if there had been an untouchable maintenance fund started when Ike built the interstate highway system in 1950s+. Have to start some time.
Maintenance needs should take priority over expansion.
Build NEW infrastructure. That will reduce the need for maintenance of existing infrastructure, reduce congestion, and reduce pollution.
Focus transportation enhancements where the density is increasing or could be increased. Completing the interior of the transportation system is most important... not adding improvements on the fringes. Small capacity improvements (striping, adding turn lanes) can be a program all of its own.
Mileage tax higher rates for commercial users (cause more damage to roadways).
A tax that is based on miles traveled should be considered to offset gas taxes.
Do not consider taxing populace for improvements without their assurance that the improvements will be adequately used.
If we’re moving away from dependence on gas tax revenues, then it’s time to move toward taxes that reflect the impact of various vehicles on the transportation system. Higher taxes for studded tires, higher revenues from heavier vehicles, etc. The smallest, lightest weight, highest fuel efficient vehicles should get the biggest tax breaks.

This question is so vague and non-specific as to be pointless. Shame on you, survey writer, and shame on whoever made you put this question in this form. It degrades the integrity of the survey. What were you looking for? A stupid answer to a stupid question?


If it’s easier for the working class to get around then we’ll do more things for stimulating the economy. ie going out to eat, movies, other events.

Yes new developments should have to seriously pay their way to enable users of these developments to efficiently get all the way to a major freeway or highway. ALL THE WAY, not just out of the new subdivision.

Taxes, bonds, however it would be done.

How to provide equitable funding throughout the region.

More light rail.

The long-term growth plan. It’d be nice to see light rail come out further, than Milwaukie. Right now, it can take 2 hours to take public transit from Clackamas Community College to the area around Portland State. It’d be nice to be able to have a shorter commute to the workday.

The entire region needs to share in the cost - for example, Clackamas County should not be able to opt-out of funding a project such as the Sellwood Bridge Replacement.

So long as the investments are for roads and not light rail, which is wildly expensive and of low return on investment. I also believe government should have to account for the dramatic increase in costs in doing business before entrusted with additional funds.

Raising taxes will always be a challenge. Maybe seeking ways that private donors would be willing to adopt roads, expressways, etc.. through foundations.

Just the total elimination of the use of transportation dollars for anything other then roads and highways, would truly help. All funding for transit, PED & Bike should come from voter approved projects, period! We have been stealing from our highway and roads funds for too long and now we are in trouble.

While I urge increased funds directed toward better maintenance of our roadways these dollars cannot be from increased taxes, nor from police and fire budgets, but need to squeezed from other sources.

Investments of this sort should take into account climate change before they are even approved, much less before they begin.

Maintain, yes, but update as well.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>97045</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>97051</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>97053</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>97055</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>97055</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>97055</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>97055</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>97058</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>97058</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>97060</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>97060</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>97060</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>97060</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>97060</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintain what we have, FIRST, in class A condition! Replace what needs replacing (example: Sellwood Bridge). Find a way to tax those that use the facility (example, Sellwood Bridge) equitably with those who own it (Multnomah county residents), since most of the use (example: Sellwood bridge) are NOT Multnomah County residents. Same answer for the I-5 Columbia Crossing (Oregonians don't use that much, Washingtonians DO! They should buy it!).

Money used wisely and accountability.

Who wrote these questions? These are banal questions without any consideration of thought process outside of Metro. Yes, I support transportation investments, primarily in reducing car commute times and increasing safety. Afford more parking and wider roads for ease of navigation...unless of course, that is not what you want. If not, just say that you are wanting to restrict movement and increase car commute times and increase parking difficulty. Just be honest about it and quit cloaking it in the name of greenhouse gasses or safety. Not everybody has the flexibility of jumping on a bike to go to their coffee shop job; some of us have to actually wear suits and act like professionals, going out of town in the blink of an eye to meet clients and grow a business. Please stop restricting our ability to make quick and easy transportation decisions. It is destroying our agility, flexibility, and efficiency.

Tualatin needs to be better connected in Tualatin.

Trying to find more north/south routes so not all travel has to be on I-5 or 99. This will be difficult, given neighborhood reactions to increased traffic, but the need is there.

It's a no-brainer. Maintain what we have; improve on it. Make it so people want to use it and CAN use it when they need it.

All options within reason.

Sure but let's not stick it to the business community. Want to tax people, tax individuals so everyone has 'skin' in the game.

One Tualatin mayoral candidate is advocating for an entirely new bus transportation system in Tualatin, which I think is redundant. Plus, she wants to eliminate any access to light rail, which I find backwards. We should be expanding access to light rail. The state is finally upgrading and reinforcing our bridges, so that's good.

This sounds like a pitch for more money. I'd support a significant gas tax increase if the legislature would reinvent the Highway Trust Fund, and then spend gas tax money only on road improvements. Metro should get no more dollars from said tax.

Not Light Rail.
Assemble the best organizational delegations to lobby the hell out of the legislature and Congress to raise taxes -- on corporations and the wealthy -- and spend that money on such transportation needs. Also, raise the gas tax and supplement it with programs to institute a per-mile driving tax and the equipment and policies needed to collect such per-mile revenue. Lastly, don't let the trucking lobby get away with any subsidies, including implicit ones.

Raise the tax on gasoline, then use the extra money to fund only roads, (NOT rail, arts, social justice programs etc..). Sell it by making it impossible to shift funds already allocated to roads to non-road pet projects when the tax is passed.

Try to couple like investment programs to get the most for your $.

Get the money before you spend it.

Should be weighed against the gradual change to alternative infrastructure.

Make the movement of cars and light trucks the highest priority. Folks here will drive, so the easier you make it for vehicles to get around, the less they will sit in traffic polluting.

Keeping cost to a minimum. Not raising taxes.

Tax electric and hybrid vehicles on a miles driven basis.

The state legislators need to get their act together to pass some state transportation funding and increase gas taxes. If necessary, Metro needs to do if the state won't.

I support user fees. Tolls and fares that service operation and maintenance. I support bonding to develop new infrastructure, but I know new lines are not popular with citizens. Sometimes we don't know what is good for us.

Get a new bridge built to Vancouver and increase the number of lanes available on the major access freeways to improve commerce in our region.

Within a budget.

Again, your question invites answers which you can translate to your purposes, not the public's. Maintain the horrible roads. Say roads - not infrastructure which is a code word for ignoring the needs of the people. 'New improvements to accommodate a growing region' - translates to forcing public transit where the people oppose it. I mean REALLY OPPOSE IT.

Users should pay according to levels of use. Tolls for high capacity express lanes. Bi-State bridge tolls across Columbia River. Purchased passes for bikes crossing bridges and set aside corridors for bike use. 10 year moratorium on Rail, Light Rail and Street Cars in Portland region till demand pays for current use.

Emphasize creation of local blue collar jobs, investment in infrastructure for future residents. Demonstrate frugality and transparency in spending precious tax dollars.

The primary focus should be on infrastructure for cars and light trucks, since that is how most of us get around.
We need to be thinking about population density down the road and not continually playing catch-up in regards to roads and transportation. Build things bigger than currently needed where forecasting shows it will be needed bigger in the future.

Yes, infrastructure is key to being a first world country/state.

Light rail along route 43.

Increase gas tax.

New funding in the form of an increase in the gasoline tax, expend more on freeway lanes.

The region should prioritize active transportation projects. Help raise new revenue for active transportation and support maintaining existing transportation infrastructure and applying new technologies to improve and accommodate for a growing region.

Maintaining infrastructure allows bikes and pedestrians to be on roads safely with cars, and good roads and bridges help keep traffic safely moving in inclement weather and congestion periods of travel.

A menu of options for different communities. What works in Portland won't necessarily work in Gresham and vice versa.

This is essential. Infrastructure funding has been declining for the last couple of decades. Some new form of funding must be developed, such as an investment bank. Local CIPs and the RTP are useless documents without appropriate funding.

Regional leaders screwed up the westside bypass, which is now only a dream. They screwed up the Columbia river crossing. funding without leadership and without a plan will just produce more bureaucratic waste.

Build Roads! Build Roads! Build Roads!

We need and want a new westside freeway to connect I-5 at Wilsonville to 26 @ Hillsboro.

Maintenance schedule of every aspect. What is most needed, used. What funding is available for what project. What capital projects are coming...and get the public ready for all of it LONG before it needs to happen.

Congestion is a growing problem for the metro area - it seems to have gotten much worse in 2014.

Since I'm not a homeowner, I don't know if they would support more/newer taxes, or where the money could come from.

Move away from the old system of relying on gas taxes to fix roads.

Higher taxes.

Growth is good.

Don't grow your region into Helvetia farmland.
I will support more funding, but the funds can't be for just more MAX or Bike lanes. We built MAX wrong from day one, you can't have express trains, so it is little more than a slow street car system. Bike lanes should be part of a wide sidewalk, it is dumb to build a bike lane to the same standard as a road bed to support a truck that is 80 thousands pounds.

Implement a pollution/carbon credit system of some type that will transfer funds from the private sector to public transportation and infrastructure development as the improved system becomes more sustainable.

Be sure that the transportation infrastructure is in place to support growth.

Nobody will click "no" we need no investment. However, investment needs to be limited and efficient e.g. replace bridges with basic structures not ornate ones.

Should consider street use, restrict heavy loads to transit corridors, not very street.

Yes, but I am a moderate. NO MORE FREEWAYS. I believe we have to be more efficient with what we have.

License all forms of transportation, including bicycles, and use that $ to replace the lost gas revenue.

Tri-Met in particular needs assistance and oversight to enable it to better manage what it has. The service has deteriorated so much that in spite of believing in it, I was forced to resort to driving because my needs were so trampled on.

Fix existing roads first.

Usage of roads are always important, age and safety are a high priority.

Fix the potholes, patch the streets, invest in one-step repaving machines that can remove/recycle/replace roadway materials in a single pass.

A bridge in east county.

Do NOT raise our taxes yet again. Try this for a change: manage the money you already get in a more efficient manner. If you knew that you had to be wise stewards of the money I suspect that you could do so. But thinking that there is always more tax money available is a foolish way of handling costs and expenses.

No further comments on this - I don't know enough about investment opportunities.

Careful planning. Just maintaining what exists seems to eat up all the money.

Pursue projects most likely to be approved or funded.

Maintenance of roads should be a priority of government - pet projects should not be even close to the top of the list.

Private sector road construction should be eliminated in favor of public road construction and maintenance. OR, if not construction, at least maintenance. Now there is a 150,000 dollar limit on projects that government entities can take on. Consider inflation .. 150,000 dollars will not fix very many linear feet of Division or Burnside. Have the city buy a monster paving machine that rips up and rebuilds asphalt roadways, one lane at a time, continuously .. 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, somewhere around the city.
Raise taxes at your peril. A tax included in the purchase price of studded tires, electric vehicles and hybrids might be okay. Truck traffic must be addressed as well.

We have to maintain what we have and what we are going to build if the region is going to continue to grow find new ways to fund transportation and manage growth. Transportation is a key factor in the live ability of our community.

I support diverse sources of dedicated funding. A property owners fee, higher license fees, sales taxes on autos, etc. Spreading it out will make each bite less painful.

Fair distribution of cost--gas tax alone no longer taxes all the users.

Please improve TRIMET seating!

Definitely, but that doesn't mean more fees and taxes. Do not spend existing transportation funds on non roadway projects. Actually use the money coming in on roadway improvements to make it easier for cars to get around over public transportation and bikes.

No one wants to see their taxes go up. Any revenue increases need to be fair and reasonable.

Mostly we need more efficient use of the current funding, not wasteful projects.

User funding.

Have you ever been on Hwy 212 on a Friday afternoon near Damascus? There's a bottleneck that needs to be fixed.

Tax gasoline to reflect the true cost to society that the internal combustion has and will have and use the money on better, safer, healthier, more environmentally friendly transport. If people paid the true cost of driving, they would be more inclined to take alternative transportation more often, to the benefit of all.

Stop wasting/diverting transportation $$$ on unnecessary bridges, bike/ped paths, and uneconomical mass transit. Build and maintain roads for motor vehicles. They are expensive "feel good" projects that solve no problems.

Index and raise the gas tax.

You can maintain what we have or watch it decay to the point it will require a complete rebuild costing 10 times as much. No choice on this issue.

Consider surcharges on large businesses (Intel, Nike, et al) whose employees and operations inordinately impact our infrastructure while avoiding payment for it.

That all commuters help pay for improvement, not just motor vehicle drivers!

Better gas mileage have reduced gas tax collection. We need adequate dollars to maintain current and implement new infrastructure.

Be creative in financing without raising taxes or costs. People are already being stretched enough financially.

Only within existing tax revenues. If additional taxes or fees are assessed, the answer is no.
In the areas that are growing, development fees should shoulder the largest burden of paying for the new needs.

Investments should go first to road maintenance and new highway construction, not light rail.

I support this idea but where do you see the funding coming from?

Proper maintenance and enhancements to the existing infrastructure is a key ingredient to keeping traffic flowing smoothly.

Most important is improving and expanding mass transit.

As I’m sure you are already accounting for: things always cost more & take longer than you would think.

Faster please. We need more lanes, new roads and bridges.

Prioritize maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure higher than new improvements. Establishing stable and sustainable revenue for road maintenance needs to be a top state priority. But in the meantime, local governments are doing whatever they have to to fill pot holes. A regional approach to a stable, sustainable and balanced allocation of revenue for road maintenance would be a great improvement.

I do not think additional funding is needed but I do support securing current adequate funding.

Just look at the disasters caused by TriMet’s failing infrastructure this past year! Is there any day now that they aren’t providing service alerts because there is a 'mechanical issue' affecting the trains. Of course we have to expect delays now. What a joke!

LOWER the price of Trimet, paid for with higher parking costs. Charge more to private lots, who will pass costs on to those parking, and charge more at the meters. Make pricing so that transit is appealing. I use transit to go into the city alone, or with my spouse, but with kids, the costs are too high, so driving is still cheaper. If transit’s price went down about 30%, and parking up about 30%, it would maximize how many people use transit who CAN use it but choose not to use it.

Except for toll bridges and roads. No tolls should be considered. Very anti human.

Efficiency and stewardship of investments.

Increase the gas tax, but commit to an incremental additional project map to promote what voters get for the additional tax. Demonstrate additional value across the modes.

More investment in maintaining what we got.

Absolutely. This is crucial. If we want to achieve our 2040 growth concept, we'll need greater federal funding. We must acquire and invest these funds wisely, and frequently.

This is probably my highest priority for planning and development. If the system does not keep pace with the population and industry growth, it will stifle everything else.
Perhaps the fuel efficient vehicles need additional taxes since they are not paying as much in gas taxes but are still using the roads.... perhaps vehicles that can't pass emissions need to be targeted for it's no longer cost effective to keep getting temporary license extensions.

Transit and other active transportation investments should be given top priority.

Funding sources should help encourage better transportation options.

As long as the new improvements are for the roads and highways and not TRIMET then I am all in!

Yes as long as higher priority is given to options with a lower carbon footprint. The area already has a solid reputation for environmental awareness - we need to build on it.

It should be a mileage tax and not a gas tax. All cars cause road damage, hybrid or electric or not. They should all have to pay for the road development and maintenance. There is this false notion that electric cars don't pollute, but that is not true since the electricity comes from the grid, and certainly is not 100% renewable. In fact, there is a finite amount of renewable and adding new cars to the grid causes us to burn more gas and coal.

Improve transportation options between Hillsboro and Forest Grove via TV Highway. Improved walking and biking lanes by removing train tracks on northside of highway and change to bike walking lane.

Spend money only on new bike lanes and sidewalks. A few potholes help to slow down drivers and that makes our streets safer.

Always consider value when weighing maintenance versus replacement. Traffic area use.

I think we need to be smart when we plan our transportation investments. I live in the Portland area suburbs, and our area is growing, which means the traffic is often terrible. There are areas that think ahead and end up with a high quality of life via transit, walking, and biking. Then there are areas (like Los Angeles) that invested in roads instead of transit and other alternative transportation, but they still have traffic nightmares because everybody is in a car. I think that public opinion will generally be to create more roads, but I don't think that public opinion is always wise for the long-term future. I think planning experts should help design something that our children will thank us for.

Reduce use of cars and reduce driver-only commuting.

We know we need money to get the job done. We also know the community will grow no matter what. Planned funding for future needs is essential.

Priority should remain on active transportation funding.

As stated in previous item, we need to maintain what we have before we invest in new or make improvements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User ID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97132</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It goes without saying that this needs to be done in a prudent and businesslike manner. Maintenance of these roadways must be done without regard to supporting a political and ideological agenda. It is because of these agendas and mismanagement that the City of Portland finds itself in such trouble. Throwing added money at this maintenance backlog without changing the thinking will only replicate the existing problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need better prioritizing of that funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get some really good strategic thinkers to help visualize what we need and how good it could be. Then, pass it off to people who are proven implementers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build the Westside bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But not if it means the taxes will be raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes on maintenance, need to look carefully before expanding to make sure if the need is there and people to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using a non-elitist approach. The greater good for all citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but only if they are used for roads. I am not in favor of more taxes for public transportation options. Our citizens voted against max but the government put it in anyway. Please listen to your voters!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't dig up old roads or paved forest roads!!! Use them for cycling routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97140</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A more equitable usage taxation and usage system for public roads would be great. I however am unsure of how to implement such a system, the current ODOT test of miles driven to replace gas tax just feels cumbersome (driving diary and refund checks in the mail) or creepy (GPS in cars). If an equitable and efficient system of taxation could be created I would be very interested in seeing it put into place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income tax-dependent Oregon depends on a workforce that is able to get to work on time, draw our wages, and pay our taxes. We all lose when our productive workforce is stuck in traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need more buses. NOT more light rail which is a waste of our valuable transportation dollars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raise the gas tax to pay for road repairs, investments, etc. Prioritize mass transit and pedestrian uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take a closer look at the suburban transportation infrastructure and how it changes when it reaches Portland city limits. An excellent example is the road over-development in Washington County where four lane high-speed roads narrow into two lane residential streets once they hit the West Hills. This is a serious problem that needs to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some priorities, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I support a Carbon Tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditionally support - - it's clearly very important that PBOT secure more reliable funding. I don't support a tax that levies an equal fee from unequal road users. A gas tax and/or a sales tax seems like the obvious way to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97201</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raise the gas tax or pass a carbon tax that would provide a generous source of money for transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A series of "show" projects to develop public trust.

Public transit first.

As needed--I am happy to be taxed for the public transportation services we have.

But not new highways. Focus should be on bus rapid transit. If buses were more like MAX trains, more people would ride them. Suburbanites are afraid of buses because they think they are full of low-class and mentally ill people.

Yes, within reason. Nothing we do should encourage sprawl. Keeping the urban growth boundary intact and providing transport that encourages infill is important.

Since there was a increase in property tax revenue (PPS received 16 mil extra!) then the city also received extra so apply that to existing infrastructure maintenance and stop the idiocy of a street tax. If you don't have the money, you can't do it; that is what happens with a family is low on funds as MANY are!

Stability and fairness.

Although we know how important it is to accommodate the future (growth & resilience to forecasted stresses), acknowledge that most people in region expect that our current revenues go to "maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure" first. If people are driving less, reduce expansion of auto infrastructure. Simply fix problem areas. Re-balance revenues to reflect (even boldly change tax structure, rates, & plan for carbon taxing) so the sources of costs pay the costs.

A MAX line down Hyw 99 West (Barbur Blvd) would be a phenomenal addition, but the federal funding doesn't exist. This is a long-term investment that would pay dividends for the region and funding opportunities need to be found for this essential infrastructure investment.

Maintenance, including preventive maintenance, of infrastructure is most important.

Support infrastructure, but don't rely on more roads and bridges for cars and trucks.

This one I support with a caveat. I think maintenance and stability of the transportation infrastructure is far more important than looking towards growth. Growth is not a valid indicator of health of the region, and I think it is more important to make sure we maximize what we have, for the best health of our people and our community, so we have the best foundation for supporting growth, which should only be our secondary concern.

We should be able to come up with funding solutions that are fair for all and also, fund everyone (drivers, bike riders, transit riders and pedestrians). This way we don't end up fighting among each group over funds.

It all has to work together.

We need more roadways and travel lanes.

Funding for operating expenditures should be increased to maintain current levels of service and possibly expanded to restore severely degraded infrastructure.

Innovative ideas I would support. More of the same will make matters worse.
And where do you expect to get funding? I’d offhand suggest tax-free bonds.

Not to roadways, but yes to transit and walking & biking facilities.

Light rail a priority.

Yes I support funding for transportation investments. Especially if those investments come with a commitment to Complete Streets--designing, building and maintaining the roads for the ease and safety of all users.

Make sure the resources currently available are actually going to real transportation improvements.

Emphasize alternative transportation modes, rather than Automobiles & trucks. To improve air quality and cut down on air pollution. And alleviate traffic jams.

If at all possible I think it’s important to try to ensure affordability for everyone. Also to make sure the current systems are safe (for example in a disaster such as an earthquake) as a priority.

Roads and buses yes, but enough with the bike lanes and road diets.

Attach an infrastructure fees to car insurance. Perhaps a small tax on new bike purchases ($5-$10), in the spirit of sharing the burden. Increase DMV hours and simplify the DMV's forms and procedures; incidentally, raise the price of registration. The costs of building should include the present value of the money that must be spent in the future to maintain and repair the road or other feature, and the estimate should be at the high end of the range. This will allow planners to make better choices (if appropriate) that will save the community money over the long haul by requiring less maintenance.

I think this would be good, especially as it benefits public transportation (more frequent buses, etc) and bicycle and pedestrian movement.

Transportation funding needs to be stable and user based (i.e., the users of an infrastructure should pay for the maintenance of that infrastructure).

Safety first partnerships between private and public perhaps businesses maintaining public areas with their private funds.

We need a higher gas tax or some kind of mileage tax (I drive a Prius and am not paying my fair share).

Equity is a huge issue that must be taken into consideration.

BUT Oregon is already one of the highest priced states for gas. Many citizens need to drive daily. Taxes should be minimal....not over $0.02 per gallon. Gas stations should be more regulated for price gouging and inaccurate/defective pumps along with the elimination of bank/credit card fees at the pump.

Consider tolls to tax road users.

The original Urban Growth Boundary contained an adequate freeway system. The freeway was abandoned due to misinformation that freeway expansion doesn't work. We need an adequate system that serves the region as indicated by planning efforts in the 1970's. Gridlock sucks and it's only going to get worse.

Once again, emphasis on public transit and non-automotive infrastructure first.
A hedge on the yes. Maintenance of the existing - yes. New improvements - need to know more.

Gasoline and diesel fuel should be taxed at a higher rate not only to fund transportation investments, but to encourage use of alternate transportation and purchase of more fuel efficient vehicles.

Yes, only as related to mass transit. Minimal expansion to road maintenance unless it is focused on disadvantaged areas.

I do not support investments which will induce additional VMT.

Trimet continues to charge riders more and more for less and less service. Despite significant decrease in gas prices this year, riders have seen no reduction in the cost of fares and passes, which are onerous and amongst the highest of major US cities. Trimet management needs a drastic, complete overhaul, with far more third-party oversight and public engagement.

Increasing the gas tax, linking the tax to inflation. Levy new tax based on mileage driven (if people allow their driving habits to be monitored), or a new flat fee on all vehicles.

Don't build roads/lanes expecting it to ease traffic, it won't. Just focus on what is truly needed, no more.

Let voters decide on a gas tax increase, or property tax, or business tax, or bicycle registration mandate.

Public transit outside a few urban areas is a joke. Support for passenger rail travel is trivial--DO something! Unless you drive, you get nowhere in Oregon. Infrastructure should not be geared to big trucks--get reasonable with weight limits--LIMIT them.

In the face of climate change we have to drastically change how we use private transportation. Building public transportation could be a great source for clean energy jobs while also helping us create sustainable cities and neighborhoods. We need to take a systems look at how these things fit together - creating the right kind of jobs for a clean energy future, and making sure all people in our city have equal access to transport and jobs.

Is there a choice?

Put a higher gas tax.

I think we should definitely maintain what we have, but I would like to see us pursuing "adequate funding" to make our transportation system climate smart and multi-modal. If "new improvements" means expanding the system for cars, I do not support that -- because by truly building a multi-modal system we can already accommodate a growing region.

Congress is paralyzed...we need more state and local transportation funding by making some bold decisions and taxing ourselves.

Maintenance needs to take a front seat to new improvements for awhile.

Sustainability of existing infrastructure and its improvements. Insure that policy implementation does not result in infrastructure improvements serving to spur growth.
Look for cost-saving in keeping agencies from being/becoming top heavy. Too much is spent on expensive studies and too many managers.

If the improvements are in repairing existing bridges, and in improving public transit. I don't support wider roads, more freeways, or allowing the region to grow out. It needs to grow by using our city spaces more efficiently and more densely.

Let's not maintain the existing infrastructure that just gives personal autos priority. Let's maintain and expand the parts that are leading people to get out of their personal cars, so that we don't have to pave over our beautiful region to accommodate steel boxes that just sit unused 20 or more hours each day.

Business and corporations that benefit from this should bear their fair share of this expense.

I think perhaps it is time to take a breather with mass transit, in particular light rail. Spend more resources looking at our existing infrastructure and see how it can be improved. Maybe adopt technology to make what we have more efficient. We need to get Clackamas County and Vancouver on board for a truly regional approach to transportation needs. Global warming is going to make the Portland area a very desirable place for many people to move to.

TriMet should increase payroll tax to pay for more bus service. Metro should pass a transportation bond issue to boost bike and ped improvements.

User pays: higher gas taxes, bicycle registration fees at point of sale etc.

Especially providing for those who can't afford it (low cost public transportation).

Duh.

More MAX and bus lines to connect suburban areas.

Would love to see visions become reality. Especially I'd like to see Outer SouthEast Portland get tons of biking infrastructure--it's perfect because it is undeveloped and flat.

Yes, but the taxation should be innovative. The only levers you have to pull are employment taxes, property taxes, and business fees. A comprehensive system that uses discount incentives to encourage the behavior we want, as well as higher taxes for crappier behavior, should do the trick.

This is pretty vague. Fix what we have so it doesn't break and cost more, make sensible improvements. avoid building bigger roads.

The fuel tax needs to be increased as a method to increase revenue and tax carbon emissions.

Yes but no widening streets.

Vehicles should pay for street repair according to how much damage they do to the street. Thus, vehicle weight should be the primary determinant - coupled with miles driven. Trucks don't pay in proportion to how much damage they do - this should be corrected.

Should be worked out without special charges perhaps thru car reg fees or gas tax. Cars do more damage to roads than bikes and pedestrians. Trucks and heavy vehicles should bear more of the cost.
Carbon tax.

Buses!

More money for alternative transportation! higher tax, implement tolls for alternative transportation.

Thanks for upgrading the bridges and adding the Tilicum bridge. We need to improve the I-5 corridor north of town into Vancouver, preferably with a toll-bridge. We need to give a high priority to livable neighborhoods and greenspaces when considering adding to the number of roads and highways. We also need to build these additional roads with multiple users (bikes, pedestrians) and their safety at the forefront.

VERY concerned about how this could affect those of moderate income.

Don't just build more roads. be smart.

Maintenance first!

Increased revenue for transportation choices and maintenance should be used for existing infrastructure, NOT expanding capacity of roadways.

Emphasis on mass transit and bike/pedestrian infrastructure.

Need to spend the money. Not growing out. Higher density.

Certainly I support that investment, but this is a very vague policy statement.

I will happily pay more in taxes, or fees or whatever, for better transit and biking and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as the maintenance of our existing roads. As with any new funding source, I would like it to not disproportionately affect the poor. I would also be less interested in a user fee specifically for cyclists (ie. new bike tax). Everyone should chip in for better transit and active transportation options because it benefits everyone. I understand that we will have to increase our capacity as our region grows but I would like to see the focus of increased capacity be on active transportation and transit.

The future is coming and no stopping it so we need to invest in this and include a re-evaluation of existing policies so that the necessary changes can be made to move forward.

Concentrated growth, continued efforts to limit sprawl. Where outlying develop must occur make sure there are options so its not just about driving. Suburban traffic is far worse than in the central city.

Cost effectiveness and safety.

Transit especially.

Fix it first!

"However, the purchasing power of federal and state gas tax revenues is declining as individuals drive less and fuel efficiency of vehicles increases." This seems contradictory, the means of revenue going downhill as the goals are met... Maybe I'm not understanding correctly.
The current ability of local governing bodies to deliver a reasonable quality of life is pathetic. Taking the initiative to counter the ridiculous propaganda favoring the unlimited concentration of wealth and income should be your first priority.

Trains are great. We need tracks separate from freight, for moving people only. High speed is attractive to some, but not me, as I enjoy leisurely train travel - but one that leaves and arrives on time!

I support investing in transit, but I also need to support other things like education. Please be as efficient as possible! We have limited money and living in Portland is very expensive.

Maintenance must be done.

User-fees and disincentives to undesirable behavior (ie: congestion charges) should be considered above general taxes/fees.

Raising gas taxes (even though gas usage will go down in the long-term, raising gas taxes would still bring in more revenue in the short and medium term that can be used to implement more alternative forms of transportation that accommodates that shift) or even considering a carbon tax, with some adjustments made for low-income people so that it's not regressive.

We need to lobby more as a region for transportation funding from the state, but also be willing to raise the money locally. Strategic consulting and campaigning support should be provided to the jurisdictions to look at ways of raising revenue and when to make the ask.

Prioritize and spend first from available resources before seeking special taxes. Operate this system like a service provider instead of beauracracy.

But only if we focus on problem areas, like road capacity, and dedicate funding to those.

Stop spending existing funding on pet projects that don't help the overall region (ie Sellwood bridge that is very expensive and has no additional travel lanes).

Insuring that commuters who require autos for their careers/business/etc are provided easy access to core-area and sufficient parking near their offices.

Yes for improving auto travel.

I don't think we need to spend a lot of money creating new roads, but we should maintain the ones we have already.

We will drown in cars if there is not more public transportation.

I support it with a caveat. I think we have built too many roads and many of our streets are too wide. Many could use the skillful work of Depave and its minions. Consider more road diets and decommissioning of roads.
More effective use of funds... better infrastructure design and construction to make these developments and improvements last longer time periods. Research technology and processes to reduce the wear of street surfaces and better planning concerning sidewalks and trees [we need both!] to reduce root damage. Control and consolidate street openings... plan communication ducts to handle multiple vendors. Maybe local some utilities in the sidewalk area vs the street.

Less process, more action. We cannot dedicate a decade of discussion and study for every infrastructure improvement. Quit doing it incrementally. Get high speed rail in place... express trains on MAX. Put MAX underground in downtown Portland.

Equity and need--many communities lack sidewalks, and they need to be treated as a priority.

Limit investments to those that support compact, mixed-use, walkable communities.

It's time for either a sales tax or a car and bike registration tax that could help fund maintenance of the existing infrastructure.

Not for widening and expanding roads. Only for public transportation.

Yes, maintenance is good. Securing funding is good but don't spend it putting in more trains to other communities. Work on fixing what's broken within the cities first. (soon it will be faster for me to get to work from Milwaukie than from my home in inner southeast Portland).

We should be collecting SDC's for new infrastructure, we are not securing adequate funding for maintaining infrastructure. How about a new gas tax (I drive a lot)? How about a way to tax vehicle usage based on impacts to roads (weight etc)?

See above: significant funding should come from feds, if we can only stop 57% of the federal budget going to the military.... ALSO: Get those developers of $500,000+ enormous infill houses to pay heavy fees for ruining our neighborhoods.

I support more $ for maintenance but not more capital for "active transportation" Maintain doesn't have the gas tax and other resources that capital projects have.

Express buses from Sandy to popular streets on SE. Express buses from Damascus to Stark, Division, and Woodstock. Express buses from Vancouver to 50th and Hawthorne, 52nd and Division, 52nd and Foster, 52nd and Woodstock.

Current infrastructure needs to be maintained in a timely manner.

Show the public why transit investing is in everyone's best interest, that over the long haul it saves money and the environment.

From users... including li.s for people using bicycles.

Seattle. Horrible transportation nightmare. Portland is heading that way. How the adequate funding will be "secured" is an important question.

Intermodal methods of transport. E.g.: cars in carriers a la Amtrak AutoTrain.
Separated bike paths!

Only if it is the collaborative policy of all the taxing governments in the region, not just Metro.

Only if new revenue is not wasted on high cost options like light rail and only if repairing current road infrastructure is first priority.

Make people moving from transit dependent cities able to continue being transit dependent.

Equity and behavioral changes. Any tax or fee should 1) be related to the user’s cost to the system, and 2) be a tool for shifting behavior from high-cost, high-impact modes (driving alone) to low-cost, efficient modes (transit, walking, bicycling, ridesharing).

Maintaining what already exists and is useful before creating new.

Pursue a variety of new funding measures to support increased transportation investments.

Road expansion (widening or network expansion) should not be considered a method for "reducing delay." The evidence on induced demand is clear. This should be expressly stated in policy.

Yes, but please prioritize seeking funding to expand our bicycle, pedestrian, and mass transit infrastructure.

Where is the money coming from? Is it equitable?

Again, priority should be given to mass transit systems including creative dispatch systems and free or very low cost fares. $5 for a round trip ticket on Tri Met is definitely a disincentive for anyone to ride the bus on a regular basis, especially the working poor, who are most in need of affordable transport.

Should be our #1 priority. It does little good to invest in many of these other areas and not even properly maintain the streets, highways and bridges we already have.

Yes, a weight and usage based fee on automobile use on public roadways plus additional fuel taxes.

Cheap/narrow residential streets... in place of dirt roads.

The fees collected for this should not be paid only by Portland residents. That is not fair, when other county residents and other state residents use the roads.

I honestly have no clue. I do not want Portland to become Houston but neither do I want daily traffic jams.

This is critical. Right now there is no funding. Where will it come from?

Get pro-active, infrastructure already compromised.

Need to focus on improving our paving backlogs, paving unpaved streets, installing sidewalks, better lighting and signage. Our street system is in disrepair and has been deprived of adequate investment for decades.

Yes, but only for maintenance of existing infrastructure and new bike/ped/transit infrastructure. Our existing infrastructure is vastly weighted towards travel in private motor vehicles. It will take decades of bike/ped/transit-only new investment to even balance the scale. New motor vehicle capacity shouldn't even be considered as an option in a climate-constrained world.

Better, safer, larger roads for N-S and E-W travel through Portland...ie: 26 should have better access from west to east.
Yes but bicycles and transit must be prioritized and should receive at least half the funding. Building more or larger roads will only make the traffic problems worse. I have lived in Atlanta (not voluntarily) and spent over an hour on a bus stuck in traffic many times covering a distance I could bike in half an hour, due to the absence of dedicated transit lanes and safe bike routes.

But only if it shifts the current inequitable distribution between roadway v. active transportation, and between capital v. operations. Oregon is near top of list nationally in supporting capital, but near bottom in supporting operations. Need to overcome constitutional restriction on user-fees first.

Maintenance of existing infrastructure - yes New "improvements" ??? - that is a loaded statement. If those improvements are to Active Transportation and to Mass Transit - Yes; if they are for a new Columbia River Crossing or expanded roads - then No.

Increasing the gas tax is preferable to imposing a street fee on residents and businesses.

I support the maintenance of streets. New improvements need to prioritize active transportation and transit. Funding must not come from a regressive tax. A good source of funding would be raising the gas tax or charging for parking. The gas tax in particular would be a good way to collect more from the vehicles that put the most wear on our roads.

Particularly transit infrastructure.

The community should pay for their transportation infrastructure of all kinds, both because federal funds are dying out, and because it should be a local responsibility.

Increased gas taxes to continue discouraging reliance on cars, encourage the use of low consumption vehicles, and support the funding of alternative transportation systems.

As long as it means better bus and MAX service, not cars and bikes.

Increase tax on gas.

I am a total infrastructure nerd, YES to infrastructure. It is the vessels and veins of our community and everyone benefits!

Make sure new big boxes pay for the road infrastructure they require. Figure out how to create a budget that takes maintenance into consideration.

Raise gas taxes!

I do not support a street fee assessed to all businesses and residents.

Again, please consider tolling.

Make sure developers contribute to infrastructure.

Taking care and providing for transportation infrastructure is important and necessary. If we have route or facility like a bridge if it is present it needs maintenance. If we build new routes or associated facilities then maintenance has to be factored into the equation if indeed it is practical to construct the new route.

Lobby for a larger pot of funds in Wash DC, consider new regional funding options based on miles travelled.
I think we should focus on mass transit and avoid building more roads for more cars.

The region needs to find a source of increased funding for ongoing operations of transit.

Safety, cost.

I am concerned that the gas tax is relatively low for people who can afford newer fuel efficient vehicles, even if they drive many miles on our roads.

Seems necessary.

We'll continue to grow and people will continue to use vehicles - it needs to be less costly to use public transport.

Maintenance of existing infrastructure is very important if new improvements mean alternatives to auto use that is good but highway expansion is a loser.

Maintain existing transportation infrastructure and forget about accommodating a growing region. We don't have money for both.

This does not follow. I would hope that there might be more creativity in the formulating of questions. What is necessary is a systematic plan under the control of a single authority but no political system in our area is about to give up power.

Moderately support. Cost Vs benefit would be the most important factor to consider... taxes are high enough already without increasing them more.

Focus on enhancing public transit, bike and pedestrian roads, over that of cars.

The burden should go on the drivers who use these resources. Tie the gas tax to inflation and charge people for parking.

Make drivers pay full costs of road use, parking, pollution etc.

Why do we want to continue to grow, and in what ways. "Growth for growth's sake is the ideology of cancer cells"

Only if it's spent on improving active transportation. We already spend too much of the little we have on widening roads.

Increase federal gas tax increase state gas tax promote smaller cars.

Developers need to foot some of the bill for expanded transportation.

Nothing should be implemented without a maintenance system in place.

But funding needs to be found from a national, regional or state effort not local taxes! Until we receive 100% of dollars we send to governments back to regional in gas/etc taxes so new taxes here.

Top priority is walking, then biking, then transit, then freight.

'More' in terms of $, but not in 'additional' % paid in by each person. Let's benefit from 'visitors' to our region (toll roads, toll bridges). Don't tax the populous. Tax the road users based on their level of use: more for trucks, less for cars, even less for motorcycles, and far less for bicycles.
This is really more a matter of working with other areas in a uniform way. The problems faced by all the municipalities are similar since the funding sources are shared. Fixing the relative unpredictability of funding for what are necessarily very long-term projects can only benefit everyone.

Here's the caveat though: increase investment in all forms of transportation besides private automobiles. Converting current auto-focused infrastructure to active transportation or mass transit will over time decrease the cost of maintaining the system, especially with a focus on active transportation infrastructure.

Bond measures.

Progressive fees -- flat taxes are not the best solution.

Please repair what we have; I don't think we need to expand hugely in the street infrastructure.

Raise the gas tax already!!!! It will incentivize all the things you supposedly want and will raise tons of money at the same time.

PARKING PERMIT SYSTEM or GAS TAX or VMT, someway to capture costs from modes that we would like to discourage like private auto use and a tax policy that encourages active or communal transit.

Maintain infrastructure and do not expand highways.

Need to minimize regressive impacts of transportation funding.

I am emphatically supportive of the need for much higher, dedicated funding for mass transit and bike/ped infrastructure (and road repair/maintenance). Oregon is being completely hobbled by the anti-tax funding constraints imposed by Prop 5 and similar initiatives, and we HAVE to get out of that straitjacket. The state and region is witnessing a crumbling infrastructure, which makes it almost impossible to plan for an invest in *new* infrastructure. The region *has* to develop a major new source of funding--not merely the Portland "street fee"--to ensure that new bike/ped infrastructure, substantially increased transit frequency and speed, and road maintenance.

Carbon Tax now.

Gas tax.

Street fee by residence is not going to work - consider a $10 or $25/year for every driver's license.

I should probably read the details on this survey, but haven't! I don't know how to do it, but many people I know say that the city of Portland has 3-5 people working to fill potholes and only 1-2 of the people actually appear to do any work. Also, as I said before, there ought to be sidewalks in all neighborhoods, including those annexed by Portland a few decades ago.

Making everyone pay to maintain roads is important: rich and poor, public and private.

Make sure that a larger percentage of the bill is being paid by those most heavily impacting the system.

Population density and employment density. As with Issue #1 in this survey I feel the most important transportation investments are those that get people from where they live to where they work (and back, in case that wasn't self-evident).
As long as the money doesn't cause an increase in taxes to business and citizens. Use what we already have.

I support with the caveat that bike, ped., and transit projects really need to be elevated in terms of funding/percentage of the overall funding pie that is allocated. Too much competition for limited funds right now so many of the projects on the books will never get built, leaving many people with no choice but to drive.

Yes but we need to get serious about what projects and PROGRAMS we are completing. We should measure the climate impact of the cradle to grave implications of projects and include this in our cost/benefit analysis. Carbon should be part of the equation for all transportation choices.

We should dramatically increase gas taxes region wide. We should not build new roads. We should not widen roads. Currently built roads should be made safe for people to walk and bike on. Speed limits should be lowered.

Yes but only if they apply to public transport or bikes.

No regressive taxation.

This is essential to getting any of the other strategies accomplished.

The region should have a bicycle, pedestrian, and transit first policy; we should not invest any money in expanding the system of roads for autos until the regional bicycle, pedestrian, and transit system is complete.

No street fee!

Reallocate existing funds to pay for this. To much money has been taken from this in the past and wasted.

Isn't that kind of a ridiculous question? Of course you have to invest in the maintenance of existing infrastructure and plan for growth... what else is public planning policy for?

I support this as long as the monies are used to increase transit/walk/bike options, not expand driving options!

I am not sure what you have in mind for "...new improvements..."

D/K

Duh

Depending on what existing transportation infrastructure. I support more investment in transit, bike and walk but not automobile travel.

Slow the process and make sure that we take care of our maintenance first.

It depends on what new improvements.

Keep monies designated to street repairs for repairs. do repairs after construction, not a month before they tear up the streets.

I would even support a dedicated tax or toll to widen I 5 corridor.

Not sure how to implement this one. Cost is the issue, where does that come from, who pays for it, who uses the systems?
Focus on alternative transportation, NOT cars.

Decreasing driving.

I'm not sure.

We should think carefully about the long term transportation vision for our region, especially given the growth that is predicted. Our of our greatest strengths, and one of the primary factors drawing educated people here, is our reputation for being a biking, walking, and transit-friendly city with a good quality of life (less smog, less traffic, etc...). We should focus on and expand these options.

The emphasis should be on secure.

Getting people out of cars.

Raise the gas tax. Build out street car lines and increase bus service. Repair old bridges. Get rid of I-5 along the river!

Please see my first comment re: We (residents in the Metro region) need to be taxed more than we are in order to keep up with these infrastructure needs. I want to pay more taxes (seriously)!

Keeping existing roads in good shape but not widening or building new ones --- they just encourage MORE development and more traffic (I came from Pennsylvania and have seen that happen over and over again - more roads means more traffic problems, not less. Public transportation! Trolleys, trains...... Make them more comfortable and not so LOUD. MAX is deafening and some people are on there for very long rides, day after day.

As long as it is not towards more highways or lanes for cars.

We have to put our money where our mouth is.

Auto infrastructure should be paid for by user fees. NOT by taxing water, using general funds, etc. Growth should be paid for by growth.

As long as it is equitable and residents have a voice on any new taxes.

Keep it simple and drop the fancy everything for everybody plans.

Investment in high-capacity transit should be heavily scrutinized. While it is necessary, our region has spent over a billion dollars on expensive light-rail project and not improved transit mode share as a result of that investment. Less expensive investments (such as BRT, and road improvements to make other bus service more efficient) should be prioritized. We can't build more transportation amenities while we can't afford to operate and maintain what we've already got.

Can you also fix Congress with that magic wand?

Priority for increased capacity should be transit, bike, pedestrian facilities.

But the funds need to come from current budgets-get back to funding basics and leave out a lot of pet projects. Most people drive and we should be accommodated, not ridiculed and ignored.

Have a sustainable approach to infrastructure financing.
Yes Sidewalks should be on every street, both sides. Many streets in the non-Portland area have none.

Yes Cost, efficiency and safety.

Yes Maintenance, yes, but let's not build roads that increase sprawl.

Yes Connect outlying areas to the city center with public transportation, especially light rail.

Yes The potential benefits sound good, but how do they spring from the policy?

Yes Once again, charge anyone driving to and parking at transit stations -- free parking is not a "right" in this world.

Yes I support additional investment, but I think it should be extremely heavily weighted towards future mass transit projects as opposed to maintenance of old highways.

Yes Focus on transit, bicycle and walking infrastructure.

Yes What's needed is to know the future - and nobody does. The recent info garnered about people wanting more apparently "suburban" lives, for instance - what will that actually mean? More cars? Less walking to the sources of basic needs? That can't happen if we want to stay alive.

Yes More investment, yes. I get that gas taxes are falling because of better MPG vehicles, and I understand that all dollars are not fungible, but street fee proposals ala City of PDX discussion will stall until payers have confidence that core road maintenance has not been sacrificed/ squandered for ped/bike and mass transit.

Yes I support maintaining roads and bridges for safety. I do not support expanding roads.

Yes Again, within reason. Keeping our current roads safe and up-to-date but not wildly expanding highways and roads for auto traffic alone.

Yes Maintenance of our transportation infrastructure is critical. We need to explore ways to reduce those costs. One important area is taxing the use of studded tires on our streets and highways and limiting the period when they are permitted on cars.

Yes Raise the gas tax! Get more revenue from gas tax as gallons purchased declines by simply raising the tax. This is somewhat regressive, but it may incentivize people to use transit and/or to ride share and cost share.

Yes Not highways or bridges across the Columbia! Transit people can use, paired with housing people can use.

Yes Major education on the importance of these investments and how it impacts all aspects of life will be part of the selling point.

Yes Policies that benefit active transportation should be prioritized.

Yes What does this mean? Is this obfuscation for a higher gas tax? I don't have a problem with that, but I suspect most people will. If you mean getting more federal grants or setting up some kind of dedicated fund, say so. Of course everyone wants stable funding. Where does it come from is the issue.

Yes Sounds good but where will the investment dollars really come from?

Yes How can anyone possibly be against any of these goals?

Yes Where will growth be? Can growth be directed - i.e. businesses and housing crop up close to public transit.
Consider taxing corporations more. Stop corporate welfare.

No fees for biking, bike registration, or any similar fee. Cars and trucks should pay for roads. Although we are trying to invent electric and other alternative-fueled vehicles, they should still bear some burden in funding roads.

I only support those projects (maintenance or construction) that are consistent with long-term strategies for meeting the transportation needs of a growing population while reducing crash-related deaths and injuries, and reducing health problems caused by sedentary/inactive lifestyles.

Also need to address the irrational opposition to transit improvements to outlying areas (e.g., Tigard, Vancouver, Lk Oswego).

Yes, without raising taxes on individuals. As a salary earning, full time employed individual, my financial health is falling behind because of the increased pressure to squeeze every dime out of me. Increases in water/sewer rates, Arts Tax, Road Tax, increasing property taxes, PPS wanting more bond money -- where does the additional money come from in my budget? I've yet to hear an answer.

Yes, but mostly for repair of major infrastructure. We need to repair our own roads ourselves, and out of CURRENT BUDGETS, not new taxes.

This funding should heavily favor active transportation. Transit, cycling, and walking should be the most strongly funded transportation modes. Any new auto-centric projects will be rendered completely unnecessary within a few years as Millennials continue to use automobiles at a much lower rate the last couple of generations. The future is active transportation and the ROI on the active transportation investments will be much higher than funding wasted on auto-centric projects.

A VMT would be a good approach to the declining revenues from the gas tax.

A good long term plan should be in place.

Adequate funding is the bottom line and is essential to the region's future.

Work with the communities to give them what they want and then ask them to pass the bonds and other funding to get it once it is approved get to work so that people can see their investments at work.

Maintenance, yes. Improvements to roads, no. We need improvements to public transportation, particularly greater frequency. We need to learn to grow our population without the increases in traffic that we've seen for the last century or so.

New improvements shouldn't focus on new roads or widening existing roads.

Yes, BUT use existing funds - quit giving 100 million/yr to the PDC. Quit taking road money to fund streetcars. Quit using road money for Trimet specific road changes like bubble curbs that cause buses to block traffic. Quit using road money for bike lanes - tax the bikes for their lanes.

Where would the new funding come from, since gas taxes are not sufficient?
No new road building with focus of funding to make non-car travel attractive. There are plenty of models out there - mostly in northern Europe.

I don't really like the monthly fee, but understand charging outside of just gas. Bikers should pay too.

Increase gas taxes. Increase fees on car registrations. Figure out a way to charge people for miles driven in Portland. Probably doable with an app attached to cars using GPS.

I do not support construction of significant new roadways. I do support investment in additional light rail, express transit lanes, etc.

Planning for a denser Portland by keeping major housing developments close to public transportation.

Choose well!

Capture rising land values in transit corridors to fund new transit improvements and TOD.

Citizens should have input and not have a new tax shoved down their throats.

But only when alternative modes pay their own way instead of siphoning off and poaching motorist paid taxes and fees for other then streets and roads.

Roads should be top priority. They are the primary escape routes in a disaster.

Invest in public transit, intercity rail and bicycle facilities, not more or bigger roads. The existing State Constitutional restriction on the use of vehicle taxes is outdated. It is counter productive, if single occupant vehicle use is to be discouraged and alternative modes encouraged.

This will be a major expense and a hard sell to tax payers. Maybe put out financial information that shows what maintenance saves versus what it will cost in the future. In other words what is the financial benefit of maintenance that the average person will understand.

Yes but I'm selective about projects. Maintain what we have and grow with a sustainable strategy that serves all road users.

A road fee that is focused on the neighborhood level would allow collection of funds tied to the neighborhood in which it is collected, giving each neighborhood the power to implement its own priorities and ensuring that no neighborhood is short-changed for funding or maintenance.

Make sure DOT priorities mirror public needs. We need to move people, not cars, so investments should follow that.

Can we do this without taxing? Are there other ways of raising funds - special events, luxury taxes.

Sure but it has to be equitable.

New fees and do not forces the riders to pay for the new infrastructure improvements. Yes, gasoline taxes and bike fees need to be explored. Our federal congressman need to get matching federal funds. Stop the nonsense of nearby cities of not funding future trimet expansion. There is no room to put a new freeway in the greater pdx area.
We need to better maintain the roads that we have. Make developers responsible for all improvements (Sidewalks, extra lanes, traffic lights, etc.) related to their projects! New projects impact miles of roadways to and from their developments and they should create and improve all infrastructure leading to their developments.

However, only if the additional funds are fees based on vehicle use, ownership, not general fees or taxes unless such general fees or taxes are imposed at the state, not regional and/or local level.

Can we stabilize funding through a carbon tax? I would support that.

More investment for highways, freight heavy roads. Mixed feeling about making it easier on cars.

Increase parking revenues by expanding metering into more business districts, and have multiple pricing tiers like in Seattle and San Francisco to optimize occupancy and maximize revenue (higher prices in high demand areas, lower prices in fringe areas) High-Occupancy/Toll lanes on I-5 and I-205. Maybe also on Powell/Division if the transit project there decides to use BRT instead of light-rail (the toll could defray the cost of providing high-capacity transit.) At congested intersections, bus bypass lanes could also offer camera-enforced tolls for drivers to bypass the queue; would require further study.

Maintain and expand the Max system. Remember that no transportation system can keep up with excessive residential development. All systems and communities have a tipping point. If you ignore that all expenditures are futile.

Lowing taxes and costs.

Lots of cities (including Vancouver BC) show we’ve got all the room we need to fit people in our growing region. No need for wider roads; less space for cars would do the job. We do need money for maintenance and transit/walk/bike investments.

Road fee based on property use; tolling of major freight routes; increased use of paid parking and parking taxes on private parking.

Again, consider making public transit free (reduces costs including accounting, fare inspectors, ticket sales). Since operational expenses tend to be not funded, figure out how to run systems differently and at lower cost. Be creative.

Car drivers should be the primary means of raising additional funding, whether it be through registration fees, gas taxes, mileage fees, or the like.

I support increased funding for maintenance but...

Lobby federal government for more control over local money to support road maintenance.
Beyond just the current Portlandia bubble, there is a lot of models which predict the Northwest will endure much less climate change than much of the nation, especially California and the South. Factoring in the exponential growth of the population with the likely to arrive swarms of climate refugees, I would be absolutely shocked if Portland does not experience massive growth over the next 50 years, perhaps even approaching a doubling of size. We badly need to invest in the future, before it's too late.

Secure adequate funding? Sounds great. I think we could get more specific about how we’re doing that. The current details just explain why there’s less money, which isn’t helpful. Finance mechanisms should consider social and economic equity however.

I think we should have a FREQUENT train service to Multnomah Falls, Government Camp, Cannon Beach, Salem, Seattle.

Sweep the bike lanes! The 205 bridge bike path is a mess of debris blown over the guardrail by trucks and cars. It also has many areas of broken concrete. We need to maintain this vital link so it is safe and convenient for everyone.

I think Portland has been getting ahead of itself in terms of light rail expansion. We might scale back and re-invest in buses and sidewalk improvements.

There are lots of folks with good ideas for healthy communities- lots of research supporting that safe routes for bikes and walking promotes this, and Ptown is a very active town.....there just seems to never be funding to do it - like the east side rail trail...I would ride on that everyday.

Stop building jails we never use and prison to spend money paying for non-violent, not property crime individuals.

VMT tax, parking fees for high demand areas, and even central city congestion-based pricing models. These funds should be directed solely at maintaining existing infrastructure and building new active transportation facilities. We do not need to build new vehicle lanes for our "growing region". VMT is flat and projected to decline over the next 30-40 years, despite the projected growth in population, density, and economic impact to our region. The future of our region does not need more vehicle lanes. It needs smarter, more dense, more equitable transportation infrastructure that safely accommodates all modes of travel while prioritizing those that are least impactful to our climate.

Increase the gas tax.

Vehicle miles traveled, plus vehicles that cause more wear and tear on the roads should pay more.

Focus on $ for safety, transit, bike, ped, system management, and maintenance - not vehicle capacity. Distinguish between needs in built up areas versus urbanizing areas. Make sure project selection and collection methods are equitable and accountable.

Continue to fix pot holes and curb disintegrations in a timely fashion.

Pretty silly not to do this.
Better education of the public about what their tax dollars are paying for.

Favor maintenance over expansion.

Those that use the investments should pay for it. Reduce large investments unless absolutely necessary.

Please do not unfairly tax residents based on their income. A municipal fuel tax is more appropriate.

I feel there is more than enough money to use if it were just used wisely. Putting bio swells on Division is stupid when it takes away valuable parking spaces. They could have been put in the grass between street & sidewalk.

One caveat: Spend the money on solutions that do not promote the use of private automobiles!

Parking, tolling, registration, gas taxes, etc. should help pay. Auto emissions are contributing to climate change. while driving is still necessary we should pay the cost to help mitigate the impacts.

Good transportation infrastructure is essential for the region.

Maintenance is more than the physical plant, it has to include the human infrastructure that supports transportation, and we have to be a lot smarter about who gets to dig up a street, and what they have to do to fix it when they are done. The utilities don't seem to be taken into account when we build or repair streets.

Maintaining is fine. But no CRC. No new exits. No new freeways!

Finding funding is going to be difficult.

Political will at the local level and a common understanding we are all in this together. Today local jurisdictions focus solely on their immediate concerns.

We do not need a new tax or fee, but someone with a little sense to use what we have wisely and more efficiently.

Federal grants, state grants, bond issues.

That encourages public transportation and safety.

Only for bikes and pedestrians.

Maintaining current bus service and bringing back bus service that was been cut over the past few years.

Forget all the fun, glittery high-tech expenditures and put tax money into basic infrastructure. We need safe roads, safe bridges, etc. All the fun stuff can come later, when taxpayers aren't hanging on by their fingernails.

This to be similar to an earlier question, moderate increase in spending for road repair. right now we appear to be treading water, increase in spending should just enough to get us moving forward.

We should continue to expand transportation options, especially in public transit.

Taxing cyclists is inefficient, ill conceived, and not a logical way to recuperate revenue lost for gas taxes.

There needs to be a good plan, and there needs to sustainable funding to expand active transportation. The property taxes are already so high in Multnomah County, so we need to find alternate funding sources.
Continued even expanded support to the non-automotive travel modes.

We absolutely need to keep up a good maintenance plan. Encourage growth along established transit corridors, add capacity in line with population increases.

Prioritizing multimodal transportation.

Making sure that new infrastructure improves biking and walking access.

Prioritize modes other than single occupancy vehicles.

Make sure that the money provided is used according to our priorities, which should focus on public and active transportation.

Major expansion of light rail (both across inner city as well as further out places).

We need a reliable funding source, yes. Spend money on transit, walking, biking.

I also support more citizen say in where transportation funding goes. This survey doesn't help highlight priorities and tradeoffs - because no plausible amount of funding will let us all accomplish all the ideals set forward in this survey.

Consider carbon at every point in the power creation/delivery chain. Tax carbon.

1) Think progressive. How can we minimize the impact of new taxes and fees on low-income folks? 2) Maximize system efficiency - How can we apply taxes and fees that encourage people to use the transportation system more efficiently (avoid driving at rush-hour in congested areas, etc.)

Yes! Although, for automobiles, the investment should be linked to use. Make people pay to drive over bridges and into central business district similar to Stockholm, London, and Singapore (although the London model of one-price-fits-all is not as strong as the variable pricing used in Stockholm and Singapore).

Metro should be studying other highly populated regions and their successes and failures. We need to prepare now for the inevitable over crowding of our region and the pressure it will place on our resources.

Gas taxes are regressive when upper middle class people can and do buy hybrids or all-electric vehicles. Formulate a tax (sales or mileage-based) that applies only to such vehicles.

I strongly favor more transit over "improvements."

Biggest bang for the buck, and increasing access to under-served communities. The biggest polluting cars are usually owned by people in the lower income neighborhoods. Improve their access and ability to take transit and the effect will be disproportionately large.

I fully support this but the funding should be broadly sourced and or use based. This seems contradictory, but I don't believe it is. Either spread the tax pain or limit it to the users who get the most from the infrastructure.

I don't understand this.
Inflation adjusted taxes need to be created to maintain existing road networks. While at the same time planning polices need to be adjusted to help make our region less car dependent. This includes the need to make ALL neighborhoods walking compatible. No one in the metro area should be more than a mile from a market and other basic services. Commercial zones need to be introduced into areas of current urban sprawl. Higher density housing requirements should be imposed near existing high capacity transit infrastructure. Improved access by bicycles and pedestrians should become part of the current UDC.

Deferred maintenance is a recipe for disaster. Reconsider a new Columbia crossing. Try to find a way to convince Vancouverites that light rail isn't so bad.

A new Columbia River bridge for I-5 that improves the flow of traffic would result in fewer emissions from cars sitting in traffic.

This should be handled without implementing any sort of "street fee," like the one proposed by Portland City Council.

Financial impact on property owners and those who pay City and State taxes.

Keeping infrastructure safe is a high priority. Expanding roadways is not. Prioritize transit instead.

I agree that the Federal government should be contributing more to our city's infrastructure. There are a few things that the city might consider doing at the local level: Charge more in permit fees for new home builds. Newer condos and homes bring more stress to the streets. Charge fees for studded tires since studs tear the streets up more than regular tires.

Frequent, reliable, affordable public transportation system is key. I'd also like to see our elected leaders end tax breaks for the corporations all together, but particularly the environmental polluters. Let's get our tax system under control once and for all. Then we'll see the funds ARE actually available to make a world class region.

But not through a "street tax"; consider increasing the state gas tax.

Since trimet consistently reduces service (there is not much after 8 PM can you start there.

I am in support of improvements, but not in support of more traffic lanes.

Always it's good to pool some funds for future, but it has to be careful how to handle. I don't want this to be like our water bureau!

It's not helpful to have TriMet frequently ramp up and down service levels, as changes (especially when going down) influence riders to consider other, more predictable options.

Automobiles contribute the lion's share of air pollution in Portland. Investment in a transportation system that will minimize exhaust and cut our carbon footprint will be invaluable.
The obvious and sane solution (so unlikely to happen) would be a gas tax that reflects the true cost of motoring on its users. Conservatively $1/gallon might enable the finding process to gain some sort of functionality and proportion. As long as auto use remains the largest public welfare program in the US it's unlikely people will voluntarily give up motoring most places.

Money is only part of the problem. Money that comes into the state is not distributed to where it is needed - why are the cities and towns getting such a small part of the money and ODOT keeps the rest or is the decisionmaker on where it all goes. This has led to some pretty lopsided budgeting.

But expanding the current roadway system is not an "improvement". It degrades our quality of life and makes our streets less safe.

Prioritize improving existing infrastructure vs. creating new ones.

Yes, more resources will need to be committed to improvement of the transportation system, especially towards "alternative" modes such as biking and mass transit that lead to overall improvements when their use is increased (unlike car traffic, which leads to worsening of the overall system when use is increased).

This is critical but equally essential is broad public support for the funding mechanism, unlike PDX current transportation fee which saw no public input prior to the Birth of Venus like rollout of the idea - great leadership.

People don't pay enough for the transportation services they use. I like the idea of a vehicle miles traveled tax to augment the ailing gas tax.

The focus on MAX is good. We do not need more or expanded highways. Too bad about the new I-5 bridge. What a disaster and too much money wasted.

Of course. This is a dumb question.

Fix the roads!

But recognize that people that have lived in Portland for over twenty or thirty years feel that they funded the original installation of most of our infrastructure, and the new Portland residents should pay more of the share to upgrade and improve based on the increase of use due to them.

But only as absolutely necessary to accommodate growth.

Raising taxes to pay for this is fine with me.

Only in a way that applies equally to all users, personal or business.

Keep expanding public transit! More busses to Vancouver to reduce the cars commuting from Vancouver! Throughout the day!! Make repairs as needed to existing services. Expand public transit!

I would prioritize existing transportation infrastructure over new building.
Find a mileage tax for electric vehicles, hybrids a combo of gas/mileage, others gas tax. Tax or outlaw use of studded tires. Most bikers also own cars... No "street" or other fees which are regressive and just a tax by another name. Fix what's broken before building new. Get neighborhood input regarding transportation decisions.

Who can afford to pay: People who buy bikes should pay a one time - investment % to maintain the system. Car buyers a one time % on the sale of the vehicle, tolls on I-5 and 205 both. 10 cents to cross - something nominal on both bridges could dynamically change our traffic issues. GET LIGHT RAIL in to Vancouver!

Portland region should seek as much federal and state funding as possible to supplement tax-based funds for building bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and transit.

Please invest in mass transit and walking/biking, not auto-oriented infrastructure.

Light rail is a great investment. But we should connect all of our lines to increase efficiency and timeliness. For instance, the yellow and red lines could create the north Portland loop and the green and orange lines could create a south Portland loop.

Again you need to think about traffic sitting there with the engines on!!! If they are wasting gas we are not being "green" we are Green washing. We also need to think of firetrucks getting there before the house burns down and people getting to the hospital before they die.

Somebody has to convince the GOP in Washington to invest in this country again. I miss the old Republican moderates we had in this state that actually knew how to get things done.

There should be an increase in state and federal fuel taxes.

Yes, there are necessary improvements to regional transportation infrastructure which should be made (such as improvements for crossing the Columbia River) but should not be overdone with over reliance on massive freeways.

I wish I know how to get more money for these things, but honestly schools need funding first. Maybe it's time for a sales tax.

with a sales tax, only.

How to minimize traffic on the highways.

However use the money you have not ask for more funds. Better planning for maintenance is needed between all areas water sewer, etc

I think it need to be a federal funded issues Looking at delta park there are huge Semi truck stations going in Old Dominion and others. They need to pay the most because they do tons of damage and create tons of pollutants.

Please repave roads. We need to pave all the roads in portland oregon.

Yes, funding for necessary maintenance will also be important.

It's inevitable.
Only if another layer of taxes is not created. combine metro with Portland’s proposed tax.

As long as the "improvements" maintain Automobility.

Please maintain the auto infrastructure we have and do not build any more of it. I want all new infrastructure investments to be non-auto - first transit geared towards needs of low-income households (e.g. not the streetcar), second active transport esp. for kids, third tech and signage to make it safe, and fourth info/incentives about all of the above so it gets used.

Have tax that everyone in Multnomah County would pay like the art tax. Exclude the poor, 185%, income and no earned income families.

Maintain existing infrastructure and avoid making more roads and highways, in order to preserve green space.

Please tie this funding source to the root of the problem: people driving. A smarter gas tax, a vehicle miles traveled tax, tolls, permits to drive in to the city, etc.

I support voter approved taxing over imposing fees unless those fees reflect USE of roads instead of income. Again, this is an opportunity to encourage people to not driving; a street fee based on income means I won't be considering the street fee when deciding whether or not to drive. I'm paying the same either way.

EQUITY. Lobby for federal increase in gas tax.

To a certain extent! Better budget management overall and lower upper-management paychecks.

Prioritizing the most needed projects.

All we have to do is find that money tree and we can build a world class multi million dollar transit system that 5% of the population will use!

I support this if it's investing in mass transit, pedestrians, and cycling. Anything outside of single vehicle use.

Yes, but a moratorium on new rail projects if the funding can not be achieved without increasing costs to riders. In 7 years a trimet ticket has increased by over 50 cents!

Community involvement.

Spend gas taxes on improvements and expansion of motor vehicle lanes.

Transportation projects not only keep traffic moving, they help keep the economy moving through family-wage-level jobs from design engineers to construction workers.

Consider growing the city upward instead of outward, to cut down on travel distances.

I support maintaining our infrastructure. But I don’t support building an infrastructure to promote growth. I don't believe more growth is what residents want. We want things to SLOW DOWN. Officials/developers have crammed non-stop change on us for decades, it's stressful and only benefits those on top. Residents lose every step of the way.

Fix the infrastructure we have now before building new.

Yes, as long as the approach is balanced - not tilted too much in favor of auto transportation.
But - I haven't been to the Zoo since they started charging Zoo members for parking and I'm not going to renew my membership. You priced me out of the market. And I'm not interested in paying a huge tax for streets, nor an inequitable fee that charges me by myself with one car the same as my neighbor who makes more money, has 3 cars and 4 kids. Some of these funding ideas are crazy.

More light rail, with connections up the valley.

Minimizing costs to community members/frequent users and better use of existing resources to make improvements to the existing infrastructure.

To decrease the cost to the environment and the transit system, create tolls, at least during commute hours, into the inner city and other heavily used centers. Consider a range of incentives to businesses for work-at-home schemes, alternative work schedules and implement them at public agencies. Always make reduction of vehicle use a benchmark when evaluating options. Institute a sales tax, and dedicate a portion towards alternative transportation options. Use a portion for road maintenance and improvement. I can't emphasize enough that I am against measures that increase the use of single use automobiles, as are so many of us in the Portland region.

Support funding for transportation investments for non SOVs.

Automobile user fees to enter city during congestion and rush hours.

Develop SE Improve SE. "except pave SW Capitol Hwy. They need it. And it can be urban renewal and crime prevention. Then new commers will move there and not SW.

I like maintenance, but not expansion!

Way too many roads lack pavement or are excessively patched and pot-holed. It makes biking dangerous. Too few sidewalks makes walking muddy, slow, and dangerous. Fixing these existing infrastructure deficiencies would help re-route car traffic to other modes of transportation.

As long as this includes bike and walking facilities.

Favor mileage tax (or increased gas tax) for this purpose--not a flat tax on residences and businesses.

This is the elephant in the room at this time within the Portland metro region and the City of Portland. Portland's effort to find such funding via a Street Fee or whatever it is being called today (City income tax). How do we pay for the needed transportation infrastructure?

Maintenance is important.

Sure, but take into account all the other demands being made on property owners and businesses.

Yes, yes and yes! However this community needs a massive educational campaign to create understanding of how vital this is for everyone's welfare.

Support doesn't mean new taxes. It might mean prioritizing budgets better. I don't trust the city of Portland, and the way they spend money.
I support maintenance, but NOT new multi-lane highways across the Columbia River and on into Vancouver suburbs.

Consider a gas tax that is based on miles driven and income for poor people who can't afford to live close to employment.

Favor improving mass transit options and safer walking over bike improvements.

Commuters into Multnomah County should be required to contribute; possible toll roads. Find money in current budget to contribute to this policy.

Investment by the community, yes. But no new taxes from property owners. Would support a State sales tax, but only if there would be major revisions and reduction in the current property tax structure. Would support a business tax or restaurant/motel tax in Portland to help finance new improvements and maintenance. Would think that Federal financing should support some of this.

I-5 corridor and also on Barbur Blvd.

Stress maintenance of existing rather than new infrastructure.

It needs to be fair and equitable so everyone who uses the road, cars, trucks, busses, and bikes pay their share. Gas taxes are outdated with so many alternative fuel vehicles so a mileage tax for vehicles and a flat user tax for bicycles might be something to research.

You can't let the existing structure fall down around the new stuff you build!

Those who build either residences or offices that will have many occupants should help pay for the traffic and maintenance of the system.

Consider the fact that a number of jurisdictions already charge a transportation fee or have a transportation funding mechanism, e.g. Milwaukie, West Linn, Portland soon, Washington County, etc. Keep the investment program simple and ensure that those who don't feel like paying end up paying! Consider not having a regional fee, if you do have a regional program this means that those in the cities with transportation fees pay more, however, establish a toll for the major highways - all who use the highway system help pay for it. (And for any future bridge improvements in the Metro area everyone in the Metro area should pay their fair share. I think the bridges should be under Metro.) Please don't do it through a property tax. Even a sales tax that protects low income people would be preferable.

Many of our existing roads are in poor condition so should be prioritized over building new roads.

Maintenance of existing is critical. New improvements should come after thorough analysis (see my feedback on the technology policy).

Pothole maintenance.

Tax the rich and corporations.

How could anyone say no to this?

Emphasize maintenance and efficient use over expansion.
I now think that we need a sales tax and a carbon tax to support our infrastructure.

I suggest that all users of transit pay toward it's maintenance, including bicycles. I do believe that another source of revenue beyond gas tax is needed and if used to enhance the flow of auto traffic, not other uses and other constituencies then it would be support, no bait and switch.

How is this handled in Europe/other countries? What fees are electric vehicles paying? Ways to get people to their jobs in a timely manner.

By user fees only. Not taxes.

Another no-brainer: increase the gas tax (which hasn't been increased in years), and/or implement a user fee, and by all means include a bicycles/bicyclists fee as well. Somebody has to pay for all those bike lanes - - why not the people who actually USE them?? I'm opposed to an income tax, as this cost should be spread equally among EVERYONE. A gas tax or sales tax is the most equitable solution. It's only regressive in the sense that people don't understand the big picture definition of "regressive."

Again go to our representatives in Salem and D.C. to get our share of the national pool.

There are a extraordinarily large number of unpaved streets within Portland city limits. This is unacceptable, and I've never seen anything like this need not being met in other metropolises.

Add a measured surcharge on all vehicle registrations (including publicly owned) based on weight of vehicle and purpose (lower for residential/personal and more for commercial), type of fuel, mileage per gallon, miles driven per year (based on insurance data).

Critically important. And if policy makers are going to use money for purposes other than the advertised purpose (yes, I'm talking about Portland's new "fee" it should absolutely be put to a vote of the people.

Increase state gas tax. Consider EZ pass tolls for Metro area bridges during peak hours.

This is vital if we are to manage continued growth. Please consider fairness and equity when determining this. For example, we really need improvements on Barbur, to make it safer for biking - and ideally there could be a max line or at least a street car from downtown to Tigard along Barbur Blvd.

Provide connectivity routes along "corridors" and in "centers" so that these important roadways are maintained in very good conditions for ALL modes of travel.

You won't achieve your climate reduction goals without infrastructure to support it. Without new funding this strategy will sit on a shelf.

When maintenance is done keep bike/walkers in consideration. I.E. many times after a re-pave the bike lane is all chopped up or not smooth.

Again, keep in mind the need to encourage bike/walk/transit when making changes. For example, the new bridge across the river is exclusively transit and bike/walk.

See prior comment.

Please don't prioritize motorized vehicles above bikes. Growth in tandem is necessary.
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Trimet needs to look at how people actually travel and how to keep them safe. Let's put some police on the max. I won't use it because I don't feel safe on it. Had someone doing a drug deal right next to me one time. Rode the Dallas, TX max and there were security/police on every one of them. I felt safe there in the evening riding it.

Consider demographics - will this improve enhance & improve the usage for this particular region.

Maintenance of existing structure with transitional-access to travelers motor-vehicle bound by the local transportation circumstances (i.e. safe and secure park-and-ride access for commuters using mass transit).

I do not support further investment with my tax dollars in new or existing motorized personal vehicle transportation infrastructure. I DO support investments in new or existing transportation infrastructure that is accessible to and benefits ALL of us without further endangering future generations' ability to thrive.

Poor infrastructure is the beginning of the process which leads to traffic delays and more emissions.

Tax private and commercial vehicles in inverse relationship to their fuel efficiency.

Move to a mileage based versus gas tax based funding. Figure out a method for taxing bicycles.

Here again you're asking multiple questions. I support maintenance, but generally don't support road capacity improvements, because we'll never build our way out from auto congestion.

Expect blowback but good leadership should push forward regardless, as it is so badly needed. Just be equitable and invest in underserved communities, like East Portland.

Postponing or omitting maintenance does not pay off in the long run.

Any taxes to support transportation investment must include surrounding county residents, not just Multnomah.

Think of other sources than JUST the gas tax!!

Static infrastructure is less flexible. No more streetcars please.

Prioritize seismic retrofitting of bridges and freight movement to attract more industries/jobs.

As mentioned earlier, maintenance is a higher priority than expansion of motor vehicle lanes.

All improvements should be for the maximization of active transportation and public transit.

Very important, get switched to a VMT system ASAP. Increase the gas tax significantly until that is done.

Prioritize bikes and public transit, and support local living / community development by reducing the overall need for transportation (more resources close to home through planning and policy).

Making improvements with room for future growth.

How to get the money, and to do it by NOT raising taxes or creating new fees.

People need to understand that paying for transportation infrastructure will make their lives less expensive in the long run.

Must be equitable throughout the region.

However the region is not growing no new taxes, there is plenty of funding if the focus is repaired.
Our streets and freeways are becoming more and more clogged with too much traffic. I don't know where the money will come from but our freeways need to be enlarged.

Start taxing vehicles by miles driven in addition to the gas taxes. Stop blowing money on widening roads for cars.

I support expanding transit, I do not support expansion of the freeway / road system: I do support maintaining the current infrastructure.

Can Metro address this regionally and use a community conversation model like the one Clackamas Community College used to craft the bond measure the college has on the Nov. 4 ballot...so that there is real consensus and support for any plan that might ultimately be on a ballot?

Gas and vehicle registration fee increases should be on the table as well as other taxes/fees; e.g. vehicle parking surcharges.

Why wouldn't Metro seek funding for transportation investments?

Good luck developing a new revenue source Education & outreach critical on this topic.

Maintenance should always be a priority. It is FAR cheaper to maintain than rebuild. Any improvements that address needs from growth should be done in a way that provide future flexibility.

How to incorporate bike lanes and sidewalks into the system and make it safe and easy for people to use bikes or foot traffic to get to their close-by destinations instead of cars or SOV.

Our Infrastructure HAS TO BE MAINTAINED and those that benefit or degrade our commons and roads greatly, should pay for that use and damage proportionate to their gains. Not the working class as usual.

I support replacements for the gas tax in order to maintain existing road systems. I do not support any new tax (under any name) for expansion of things like light rail.

I would only support this if the whole system was overhauled. You can't keep the gas tax as is AND add new taxes. I do support overhauling system so electric/hybrid cars pay their share to use our shared roads.

Buy land now for the westside loop, Hillsboro to Wilsonville. Should have done this 20 years ago.

Metro should absolutely be seeking additional funding for highway improvements to our region - WHY ISN'T METRO DOING THIS?

Certainly this is important. Public transparency and input in this area is key so people feel some ownership over the steps taken.

But not more funding for mass transit. listen to the people"s voice. this is supposed to be a democracy, but elected officials seem to thing citizens do not know what is good for them. how arrogant?

Lobby Congress so that the gas tax is indexed for inflation. Although, I am sure you have been trying.

Why does Metro turn down transit (specifically: bus) funding from the federal government?
This is exactly what government agencies should be doing. ODOT needs to be streamlined - too much waste. Then, streamline operational policies and guidelines to simplify. Then, plan for future needs by finding out what people want.

Private toll roads.

Definitely focus efforts where we get the greatest most positive results for our users.

Do it competently and efficiently. Money does not grow on trees.

Hybrid vehicles should still pay a road use tax depending on mileage driven with their registration fees. Corporations pay less than their fair share of road taxes even though they depend on the movement of goods and services to make a profit. Especially those with vehicle fleets who are buying fuel at wholesale prices for their own pump stations.

I support improvement of what we have, but I do not support expansion. It's fine to build light rail, etc. to the edges of town, but no further.

Always better to maintain something before it's falling down rather than try to replace it afterward.

We need to TAX the heck out of studded tires and HEAVY Trucks because they do most of the damage.

As mentioned earlier, the westside of Portland Metro to Forest Grove has boomed in population and no real end in site. We need more routes in and out of Portland, Wilsonville, Eugene.

Frequent low level maintenance is more cost effective than occasional major repair projects. Projects should NOT increase capacity, but should increase efficiency of the infrastructure we already have to reduce congestion and emissions.

Support general roadway maintenance and expansion if the primary driver of the project is to create walkable routes and safe cycling routes.

Building more and better roads.

Explore use of congestion or value pricing to pay for new roads and infrastructure. Embrace the technological future and let users pay the cost. Move away from the gas tax and toward more targeted pricing systems.

Light rail and busing investment is good.

Current roads should be maintained, and new roads added as needed before any more unwanted unneeded crime-trains (light rail) are added.

Stop wasting money on boondoggles like loot rail, road diets, bike boulevards, etc. and we would have had more than enough money...stop all that waste and we would still have enough.

Just auto improvements...stop the loot rail and bike boondoggles...and forget the crc boondoggle.

Stop subsidizing puli. Transit all together...end tri-met and metro....demolish loot rail or mKe it a private business with no taxpayer monies.

Do what needs to be done to fund the expansion of highways and freeways. We need to be able to travel around the region without spending hours "sitting" on a highway without moving. This must be stopped.
Maintain existing infrastructure first. I would support a significant increase in gas tax to pay for transportation needs.

This is kind of a stupid question. How could one not support "adequate" funding for transportation investments. The question is what is adequate and which investments make the most sense.

We need Westside Bypass, I-5-99w connector, widening of 217 and I-5.

This is tough - more tax money to go to more projects is hard to justify if existing roads are not being taken care of. A broader funding solution needs to be identified since gas tax money is so low.

Only if it is not focused on mass transit.

As long as they are actually being used by a majority of tax payers. Free riders (those who do not pay taxes) should not have special consideration built for them. A vibrant economy is what secures adequate funding for transportation infrastructure, not inefficient pet projects that make somebody feel good.

I want to hear about how our money is being saved instead of always being asked for more.

Need to increases rate of taxes on gas; create a tax that penalizes personally owned oversize vehicles.

The assumption is that light rail has minimum operating cost. The capital cost must be considered because most of that money is from long term bonding and to be a burden to future generations.

Not maintaining what we already have is what led to the City Council discussing a street fee. Citizens should not be punished for the city's mismanagement of funds. As the Metro region grows and expands, infrastructure needs to expand as well. More people are unable to afford living in the city center, and infrastructure needs to reflect that.

Being a resident of Washington County and working on the South Waterfront, I foresee more problems ahead. Why is there a Milwaukie line? They didn't even want it, but we could certainly use something that goes out to Forest Grove!

We all need to pay more but as I said earlier, find a way to charge those of us who use the roads. If Easy Pass can count cars on the NYC bridges, why cannot we come up with a system to charge those of us who use the roads. Maybe charging only for high use times would work at first. Courage is needed.

The gasoline tax is no longer viable as a way to fund all transportation projects. Finding new ways to fund the use of roads is very important.

I love it that we don't have toll roads in the west. BUT... we need to start tolling the I-5 bridge NOW. Leave the I-205 free. People would have a choice -- money or time. See what it does to driving behavior. The port mann bridge in Vancouver, BC is an excellent example of how a bridge can be tolled easily and efficiently, with no traffic tie-ups. We need to pay more to register our vehicles (I just renewed mine today; $50/year is ridiculously cheap).
Maintenance - yes. Not sure about new. If declining vehicle use, why more new?

How to make those who are coming into the community pay a fair price for the existing and improved transportation infrastructure.

Must pay attention to where transportation money comes from. WE must not let the infrastructure get in bad repair. It's cheaper to keep it in working order.

Well, while this policy isn't as pretty, it is necessary. You need to mend old toys before you get new ones. I would say this is priority one (so far).

As a low-income family, the only infrastructure we would benefit from is one that supports us using public transportation or bicycling to work. I wish there was a pedestrian/ public/ biker bridge connecting north Portland with northwest Portland.

Explaining the need should get you the votes but only if you can prove you are putting the money to good use for all. Another biking trail or sign for van pooling is not going to do it. Folks need ways to get around that obviously work and if they must drive they need parking once there. If these are provided and can be shown to folks I think they will vote the $ needed.

Vehicle registration fees need to be increased. the i-5 bridge needs to be tolled (ala the port mann bridge in vancouver, bc) the i-205 bridge should not be tolled. close-in bus/max needs to be sufficiently saturated to be seen as highly desirable alternatives to driving; needs high quality maintenance. ideally, expansion outward should be desired, not fought.

Each car owner could pay $25 a year per car, for renovating old streets and building new ones. It's fair also, I believe, to charge bike owners...as long as we can register with the sheriff in case our bikes are stolen. $25 a year is fair.

More money should be dedicated to public transport than roads. I must drive to work from Portland to Damascus- there is no public transit option. And I still think more light rail is the way to go.

This is just basic essential.

I have lived in Portland for 30 years and have been hearing about how a new I-5 bridge was going to be built over the Columbia River. 30 years later, it is an incredible disappointment that there is no prospect at all for a new bridge. What a joke.

Do it the areas most neglected first.
Social equity analysis of impacts and benefits - Opportunities to increase share of active transportation compared to traditional motor vehicles - Connectivity of different modes and between active transportation and transit - Opportunities to integrate active transportation infrastructure into communities in a manner that make their use an attractive and convenient part of daily life - Opportunities to address climate and GHG reduction goals - Refocus funding incentives away from metrics such as the increasing number of miles traveled and toward more sustainable measures such as trip quality, enjoyment, and efficiency. - Parking and roadways should be used as efficiently as possible to mitigate their impacts. - Parking and roadways should not be expanded if possible - Active transportation and alternative transportation options should be prioritized as ways to decrease the need for additional parking or roadways - Greater emphasis could be placed on car-share programs and other infrastructure to help reduce the need for multiple-car households - Large-scale above-ground parking at transit centers should not supplant mixed use development and infrastructure that can create vibrant community centers around important transportation hubs.

Making schedules so frequent that riders can just show up at a stop and figure a bus will be along soon.

As long as it doesn't take any money away from education, lol.

The infrastructure needs to be maintained before it becomes to costly for repairs - I have no idea how we would implement this policy as no one wants to pay for it - see City of Portland transportation fee.

Yes, not maintaining existing things is more expensive in the long term and worse for the system. New infrastructure should prioritize transit capacity and service. (Future: no surface transit! Trains should never get stuck in car traffic).

What is this at the expense of? This is all worthy but I'm concerned about opportunity costs.

Raise the gas tax and index to inflation, create a pro-rated vehicle registration and charge more for heavy vehicles/poor mileage, charge road fee for miles/driven at DEQ inspection, increase parking fees and taxes on surface lots, increase fines (5x-10x) and enforcement for speeding, running red lights, driving drunk, impaired or distracted driving, raise fees to use studded tires astronomical.

Money needs to be spent more wisely... and a project needs to be done right in the 1st place and not every few years done over again like has been the case where I live near hwy 26.

Again, the population GLOBALLY is exploding EXPONENTIALLY so plan accordingly which means don't keep projecting past increases into the future as the growth IS and will be far greater.

Such investment, however, should be filled by the private sector, not by public spending, which tends to be inefficient and politically driven. Private investment is the way to go in many instances.

Focus on maintenance not new.

Can we afford it.

Consider a graduated tax on vehicle cost/value.

Yes, but only if the investment is in new roads.

Very very small tax increase.
Focus should be on making it easier to not drive a car. It is almost to not have a car in the suburbs today. No more taxes on existing payers. Add fees for bike users. Quit spending on pet projects. And use contractors instead of public employees to do the additional work. Less expensive and gives great flexibility for seasonal work.

Yes, way more investment in the Max and Light Rail systems. More on Bikes and Bike Ways.

Yes. Invest in BIG improvements, like adding lanes to 217 and the Sunset Highway. And stop holding obviously needed widening projects hostage to the next nearest development, when the traffic really comes from elsewhere. Case study: Beaverton's hostage-taking of Barnes Road just north of Cedar Hills Blvd, a rush hour choke point because Beaverton wants to stick adjacent development with the cost of improvements made necessary by development miles to the north.

No regressive taxation.

Licensing of bicyclists and other alternative means of transportation.

Tap into new ideas world wide.

It is clear that the gas tax for funding transportation is a fading star. It should be as a disinsentive for using fossil fuels, A millage tax based on the weight of the vehicle should be the way to go.

The fastest growing areas in terms of population, and the currently over-used routes and under-served areas should be given priority.

The rate at which the population is growing, the areas that are growing, and what types of transportation will be most appropriate.

Funding must not be regressive.

Sidewalks in those growing areas where they are building houses on top of houses but NO sidewalks to connect neighborhoods safely.

Managed growth and keep quality and reliability standards before expanding.

Is there an alternative to not maintaining infrastructure? Not sure this should even be a question.

voting for the Wash Co. tax! mileage tax may be a good idea.

The primary funding source that comes up as a replacement to gasoline taxes is a road use tax driven by monitoring the number of miles driven by a car. I don't think that advocates of this system understand the degree to which this idea is feared because of possible ability to monitor motorists' travel patterns. If you ever want this idea to fly, you will have to move privacy and security concerns to a top priority, or else charge people by their odometer readings and try to get _that_ tax passed.

Emphasize express bus routes; use a portion of hotel tax revenue to expand transit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>We should be maintaining and building roads and bridges that all vehicles can use (unlike the Trimet bridge across the Willamette).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>A long term assessment of future needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>I think this is the definition of urban planning.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>Yes if noted upon by public only.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>Look north to the state of Washington for examples maintenance of roads and improvements to accommodate growth.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>I'm pretty sure we would have lots of money to spend on basic transportation infrastructure if we stopped spending so much on &quot;public transit&quot; initiatives and electronic controls or traffic management. Just use the money the public already provides more effectively.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>If you don't maintain transportation options, it will cost more in the long run.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>Efficiency and cost.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>Need a new route from Wilsonville to Longview to get traffic out of metro area. Don't spend money on 40+ year old structures which will not be able to survive a 6.5+ earthquake regardless of retrofits.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing features yes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>You can't have any of the former items without this one, so a no-brainer.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>Build more roads and freeways. Get rid of light rail. Use that money for building roads.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>Consider that this is a growing region and that having exits to other freeways, (i.e., I-84 to 205 northbound) only one lane creates traffic jams and delays. It's ridiculous!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>What is the source of funding? Gas tax, income tax, sales tax or income tax.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>We need more trains. We definitely need light rail into Vancouver, or we need to toll the bridges. We also need a rail line going west of Portland into St. Helens along Highway 30, where traffic congestion is getting progressively worse.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>It's ridiculously cheap to register a motor vehicle in Oregon, with no variation based on value, age, or energy use. Does State law allow for Counties, or Metro, to assess a reasonable added fee? Ditto the gas tax.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>We need to consider a new stable revenue stream to fund our transportation presently and for the future. Something like a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) counter on automobiles, collectable from something as the DMV or DEQ, would be one such scheme to obtain this revenue. Solid funding for transit is paramount.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>Focus on maintenance of infrastructure not on accommodating new growth. Stop growth.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>Average &amp; Extreme Incomes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>The Portland metro transportation infrastructure projects should be supported by community members who live outside of the county and benefit from these improvements.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>The Washington residents who come to Oregon need to pay a share of the road maintenance costs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are two separate issues and should be treated as such. We abandoned a sidewalk maintenance program and turned it into a "tell on your neighbor" program. Clearing overgrowth from the pedestrian way has always been a "tell on your neighbor" program. One role of the government should be to compel property owners to maintain their frontage. Government can only fulfill that role through active inspection programs. We do it for our pavement, and bridges, and signals, lets do it for our pedestrian ways as well. As for new infrastructure, only build it if you've secured long range funding to maintain it.

Seismic upgrading.

Only if it is roadways or busses.

Higher and indexed gas tax, registration fees, mileage fees, bicycle registration fees. (shoe tax for pedestrians? just kidding!).

The question of who pays seems to be at the core of the conversation. Conservatives: "no new taxes!!!" Progressives: "tax the rich!!!" These are clearly at opposite ends and are hard to reconcile. Not sure what solution is-- better information sharing about transportation needs and potential solutions that could result in a comprehensive and visible dialogue about what to do and how to do it. We all know that the transportation infrastructure is quickly deteriorating and potentially dangerous, and something has to be done, so we must address this head-on even though the dialogue will be very heated.

Rework the gas tax so that it does account for inflation.

As long as these investments are more than just bigger roads and car focused. For each new road mile we should put in 5 miles of bike lanes and 2 miles of BRT and .5 miles of Max.

Maintenance should come first before new infrastructure.

Maintenance of existing roads, have developers pay fees to build roads in new subdivisions.

Never let dirty fuel prices fall below the level where trimet ridership goes up and single occupancy vehicle usage goes down. tax fuel and spend on public transportation and row maintenance.

Long range planning – look to the future.

Please add more lanes on I-5. Congestion has become a huge problem.

Needs to consider ability pay. As someone who earns more than the average person in Portland, I need to pay more than the average person in Portland.

It'll come down to taxes, of course, it always does. I do not support another property tax. Road maintenance and repair should be paid by car and truck drivers. Businesses should carry their fair share and not be given huge tax breaks. Public transportation needs to be a national priority, not just a regional one. We should actively seek federal money for expansion of the light rail and bus system.

Maintenance of existing infrastructure - especially our bridges. This region will be devasted by an earthquake b/c of lost of bridges.
Let's develop revenue sources that are not so closely tied to gas consumption. Bond measures have been successful for library, school, and zoo funding. Let's look at a bond measure to support VISIONARY transportation improvements— not just maintaining the status quo.

Figure out ways to slow the growth!

We LOVE our bridges and I am glad to see the Sellwood bridge getting fixed but I am concerned about the cost. Specifically the cost to Portland and or Multnomah county. I know that Clackamas county residents voted down a levy to help pay for the repairs of that bridge. I have heard that we face a similar problem with WA as we look forward to build a new bridge between Portland and Vancouver. It is an interstate bridge where are the funds from the federal government? Why should Portland taxpayers shoulder the whole burden? I do not support just increasing the gas tax since the cost of gas is already breaking our backs as it is. I read an article in the Willamette Week about the revenues that the city is taking in from the gas tax and how those dollars are being squandered. Portland needs to come up with some better solutions to funding problems. I think it is important to impress upon the surrounding communities that they are responsible for infrastructure too.

If the transportation elements of Metro actually operated with the interest of the riders in mind, like a business has to, this question should never have to come up.

Link taxes to actual miles driven. Do not penalize fuel efficiency.

Expanding the bike path network. Also tax breaks for those NOT having children, rather than the other way around. Rampant human population explosion is nonsustainable and should be discouraged.

Invest in better roads, highways and freeways.

Again, you are listing all of the great things that will happen as a result, but how is it to be achieved?

This should already be covered in the taxes we pay. Maybe our elected leaders should budget better in order to make this a reality.

Portland, itself, is incredibly inefficient—will be tough to get people to pay for improvements unless City Hall cleans up its act. They are in the dark ages.

Please build a light rail tunnel under OHSU and Hillsdale.

Already discussed.

The focus and funding commitment should first be on transit, biking and walking. Then on local roads and routes and last on highways. Service to residents living within densely populated areas, then suburban and rural and finally passers-through.

So long as the investment is NOT related to transit, but rather maintaining the existing roadways, I can support this. If this question is intended to secure additional funding for transit, then I do not support the investment.

What kinds of taxes should support transportation?
Alternatives to rail should be considered for future infrastructure, e.g., bus rapid transit. More routes are needed in the suburbs. Funding sources shouldn't come from fares. I would support sales tax as a source. A carbon tax to address climate change could be used to fund transit expansion.

Encourage density (which encourages use of non-car transportation) and don't subsidize sprawl (which incents overuse of motor vehicles).

But clearly articulate that these projects are investments in the neighborhoods and communities they serve; for business, education, health, creating more capacities in their communities.

Service improvements to existing infrastructure will have a proportionately larger improving effect than expanding infrastructure. So go ahead and increase service and of course prioritize maintenance to infrastructure.

Convince everyone to pay their share, don't just expect gas taxes on cars to pay for everything.

Implement the South Portland Circulation Study. Repaint the lines on the existing streets -- our current lack of visible lines dividing traffic creates very dangerous situations.

Increase fuel tax to track inflation.

We all depend on transportation infrastructure, even those who bike or walk or take public transportation to the store, school, etc. Our batteries, shoe laces, zucchini, books, mail, cleaning lady, etc., etc. come to us that way. So everybody should contribute to the cost.

Making it work down the road.

With a steady influx of new residents to Portland, maintenance will be key to keeping riders happy and comfortable, and entice new riders.

Depends on the infrastructure. I would encourage anyone looking for bigger freeways to move to LA.

Yes, only in that maintaining infrastructure is basic to the economy and jobs. That said, organizations such as Metro to oversee land use and transportation planning is key in determining what are “improvements to accommodate a growing region”. Increasing gas tax revenues is a direct tax on highway use and is a sensible solution - taxing the user either directly by highway use or indirectly with the movement of goods and services. Lack of federal support for infrastructure projects is misguided and counterproductive - I don’t understand its appeal as a cost-cutting measure.

Non-gas burning vehicles should pay their fair share, but care must be taken not to provide disincentives to the adoption of such vehicles indexing the gas tax to inflation would be good, as would increasing the tax in absolute terms.

Like I said earlier, you have yrs of gas taxes to cover all this. You must think we are all stupid. We aren't.

I support the maintenance of the existing infrastructure & support the improvements for the non-car options in the future. We do not need more streets and highways for auto traffic.
Developers need to be apportioned fees to cover added strain on existing infrastructure and improvements to handle increased population density.

A flat fee will disproportionately burden the poor. Any tax assessments or fees need to be based on the ability to pay or related to property value.

So index the gas tax to inflation. (Also, spell "money" with an e.) I do not support tolls on roads or bridges under any circumstances. I do not support a sales tax under any circumstance.

Cost vs benefit.

Costs should be shared among all user groups equally based on benefits received.

Highest priority to find stable funding source for big picture implementation - not focused on one source of funding (gas tax). MUST FIX this in order to have a chance to meet our goals!

MAX system issues suck! Fix them please.

Communities have more pressing problems than transportation.

We must adapt to the new century.

Maintain, and expand alternatives to personal autos. Do not encourage additional use of SOVs.

Remember the east side.

Again, we cannot build ourselves out of failing levels of service. Focus on community development that allows housing and employment to co-locate; review comp and zoning plans. Walking, biking, mass transit investments.

Bike & walk commuters and short distance commuters (under 2 miles) should not pay the same costs as long-distance, 1-person per car commuters. We are already doing our part to reduce traffic congestion, reduce fossil fuel use, and reduce pollution by either living very close to where we work or by choosing to bike or walk commute.

But let's keep the focus on improving efficiency and protecting our environment, not on huge projects that just bring more cars through. Think about what we want our transportation to look like 50-100 years from now and start planning towards that.

Change the mindset of the electorate toward this problem. Until we do, funds will continue to shrink while our transportation problems become more acute.

Absolutely, we're losing ground on our extremely valuable livability and quality of life because of gridlock in many areas, primarily due to a lack of capacity of freeways and thoroughfares.

Do not overbuild streets. No ring roads or other classic planning disasters.

Yes, but is government capable of doing this? Get back to basics -- pave ALL the streets -- put in sidewalks everywhere they need to be so children can safely walk around- this is vital in the "neglected' areas of the region.
Dedicate a revenue stream for road maintenance which cannot be raided for other purposes. "Road maintenance" should include pavement, sidewalks, curbs, and lighting. Consider a gasoline tax to fund this that increases with inflation, rather than one that is a fixed rate from the 1950's.

The Abernethy bridge.

Raise the gas tax a few cents/gallon.

More buses.

YES. We must maintain and keep safe what we have. This will continue to create jobs (more consistently than a boom or bust build new program) and keep our infrastructure safe for all.

Having public transportation funded by car drivers doesn't make since. When more people start riding they get less money.

Let's just avoid electronic billboards if we get advertising funds, okay? There's a really bright one near the grocery store I go to most often, and it's distracting to the point of being dangerous.

Transit, not autos. transit-oriented development.

Build a vision for the transportation system that envisions the desired conditions 20, 30 and 100 years into the future.

As I said before, maintenance of existing infrastructure should be top priority. Also, it makes no sense to go to the feds for money for local projects. Why send money to Washington just to beg for it back? Why should we pay for Boston's big dig and they pay for our light rail? Local projects should be locally funded.

Emphasis on existing infrastructure and limit accommodations for growing region to those that are supported by beneficiaries of the growth pattern, including taxes on newly-developing industries and land developers to discourage sprawl. Lower taxes on use of existing structures/sites that are vacant and encourage repurposing of those structures or sites (ie. remodel or build a different structure to meet the needs of new owner/tenant) Increase tax burden on sites that are vacant to encourage reasonable rent and redevelopment rather than remaining vacant.

All people need to pay for the use of hard surface. Even if they walk and own no car. The surface facilitates movement and movement of goods. This benefits everyone. Everyone should chip in.

No brainer! Let's be proactive please and plan for the future.

Spending on infrastructure improvement help both the economy and the job market.

Bring back electric trolley buses. Cut the dependence on oil.

If they aren't maintained they aren't reliable and people won't use them. For that I will point out that maintenance is simply "break-fix". It means putting in the work to prevent the breakdown. I don't support an increase in spending to solve problems that would not have happened if the systems were maintained properly.
Sustaining our investments into the future is critical. See the City of Portland’s current problems providing basic safety and maintenance services. Oversight is critical.

A metric that measure efficiency based on people moved should replace old-school levels of service. So what if 50 single occupant vehicles have to wait 10 more seconds each, but a full bus gets 40 seconds less delay? Number of vehicles served is a 20th century metric that no longer meets our needs.

Do not build new if you can’t properly maintain old.

YES, IF IT INCLUDES MORE BUSES AND NOT LIGHT RAIL. LIGHT RAIL WILL NEVER PAY FOR ITS SELF AND BUSES AND BE CHANGED, ROUTES ALTERED AND IT DOES NOT BRING AREAS OF GETTO AND CRIME!!

We should continually be looking at infrastructure for maintenance and improvement.

Personally I would like to see more focus on bike paths for save and efficient commuting.

No new taxes, current funding should be used for what it was designed for -- gas taxes, etc for roads!

Highest priority. Change the current funding system to a cost per mile fee. This fee should be dedicated maintaining and operating the existing transportation system.

Emphasizing efficiency with cost reductions and environment improvements is key.

This an area that can really help improve our economy and employment possibilities.

We should be able to accommodate traffic on existing road infrastructure if maintained properly.

A bit more by raising the gas tax slightly.

The fact that there is not enough money to go around.

Public transportation - yes. More roads - no.

I support expanded public transit modes, but not expanded highways.

I know that means more money and nobody wants to pay. we do have gas tax which I feel is used about as good as the City of Portland uses the Water Bureau money. Make it by how much you use the road to drive (more costly) and how much you use public transportation (less costly). And make those bikers pay for bike lanes, all the painting of those green spaces, the signs and much, much more they are costing all of us.

Remember to promote all projects (roadway ones and bike/sidewalk ones) so the non-growth believers are aware of what is spent on their all important roads.

How funds are to be raised and allotted.

Increased population will increase demand so investment will be needed.

This is crucial. We must take care of the infrastructure we already have in place.

Push congress!

Get developers to pay their fair share when they put in new developments and housing as more people are expected to move to Oregon.

Improve links to suburbs to reduce horrible traffic (transit should be quick and easy); come up with incentives not to drive.
Yes Especially better streets and roads for the transportation taxpaying drivers whom supply the majority of the funding for transportation infrastructure.

Yes User fees.

Yes I support shifting investments from individual vehicles to public transit and other, non-motorized vehicles. Wealthy car-owners and the auto industry should subsidize safety measures needed to protect pedestrians, bikers, children, and the environment from cars. Cars are stealing valuable resources from our communities and environment that are needed for alternative means of transportation. Statistically speaking, cars are the greatest risk to my health and safety. That should pay for the risk they are causing me and everyone else.

Yes The population in this region is growing fast and our transportation infrastructure is going to be maxed out.

Yes, Congress should do it's part & fund the federal transportation fund. We can't maintain or repair our city roads without it.

Yes Fix TriMet, fix TriMet, fix TriMet.

Yes As long as environmental effects, safety and cost effectiveness are high priorities.

Yes Encouraging development where infrastructure exists should be paramount and development where it does not should be avoided. Development should be channeled to areas where surplus road and transit capacity exists, and development fees should reflect the need for any improvements.

Yes Again widening freeways is a good idea.

Yes Developers should not be let off the hook for their projects' traffic impacts.

Yes Highest priority. Change the current funding system to a cost per mile fee. This fee should be dedicated maintaining and operating the existing transportation system.

Yes How funds are to be raised and allotted.

Yes I've said plenty. should I reiterate?

Yes Maintenance, yes. Growth, not so much.

Yes This an area that can really help improve our economy and employment possibilities.

Yes We should be able to accommodate traffic on existing road infrastructure if maintained properly.

Respondents who answered 'NO' said to consider the following when implementing Policy 7:

1 979 No Transportation infrastructure"? You're trying to say road and autos, right. No. No!

2 94075 No Maintain what you have.

3 97003 No The monies/taxes being collected SHOULD be adequate, if the budgets are addressed properly, money is not wasted on useless committees, or overpaying staff/double paying staff for jobs already being performed. PERS.

4 97003 No Use existing resources instead of making more light rail and other boondoggles for the elite.

5 97003 No I only support this if it EXCLUDES trains of every kind. I support buses and cars and the infrastructure needed to keep them moving efficiently and quickly.
Mainly NO. Do not accommodate a growing region. There is not enough money and it will lead to stranded investments as gasoline becomes less affordable and people have to double up increasingly on housing. The future holds climate change, peak oil (peak oil investment), and even huge government debt so planning should be to get out of cars. Road maintenance is okay (why is it lumped with growth?).

We're already paying a lot for this - the money is just being wasted on big screens to tell you you'll be at your destination in 6 minutes - which you already knew, and green bicycles areas which have no benefit for the people that pay for them.

Learn how to balance your budget just like we do.

This sounds like mumbo jumbo!

I don't believe that everyone has to share funding of ALL options equally. It's not fair to those of us who limit our driving, buy hybrid or better cars and don't use studded tires to have to subsidize the selfish bozos who won't. The gas tax is no longer a fair way to measure road use, but neither is a tax that is unrelated to use and/or damage.

Just stop burdening homeowners with more property taxes. It's unfair and an unsustainable funding model.

The cost to tax payers and the bad economy the area is in a stale growth.

Show you are using what you have to help transit and not to increase the employees and subcontractors take.

Investment should come from those who are encouraging growth in the region.

You have more than enough money now, if you would stop wasting it on trains and other things that the vast majority of us have little use or interest in.

This all depends on what for your statement is to broad.

You should work on not growing the region.

I believe the current amount of investment is fine.

We need to be smarter about how we do things instead of asking tax payers to pony up more money each and every year.

I would support such investment...IF there weren't such horrible mis-management by government. Think about the proposed bridge across the COLUMBIA. $300 million and NOT one spade of dirt has been moved. Don't ask us to DRINK THE KOOL AID.

Any new build-out of housing should be responsible for the additional traffic and road use it creates.

Pot holes are better than smooth pavement. "Improvements to accomodate a growing region" is another way to invite more people into the region and more development which we don't want to encourage. And we don't want to encourage more of the same bad development we already have in WC.
I would if it actually went to roads. Not hidden projects for bike and peds. While there needs to be some investment, the dollars wasted in my view are too great. The city is asking for more money while they throw what they have away on things like the Tram, the Portland Streetcar (where does it go and who the heck rides it).

I don't trust that getting more money won't just go to expanding roads and parking lots. No more heat-generating asphalt please. No more roads.

Who will pay for and how much per rider mile does it cost?

This is a trick question. Spend money on new roads and maintain the roads that we have. DO NOT SPEND MONEY ON BOONDOGGLES LIKE LIGHT RAIL AND THE COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING!

Consider putting full time paid employees on an 8-hour workday. If they don't want to work, find someone else that does. Too many loafers on payroll. Reward those that want to work and that make an effort to put in full work days.

I support repair and maintenance if existing bur not expanded roads. If by improvements you mean improved rail systems then yes.

FIX WHAT IS THERE NOW!!!!! NO NEW TAXES!!!!!

Government needs to be more efficient with the funding they have now.

Developers should pay.

Why should we encourage growth?

We do NOT need additional transportation money. Instead, we need to prioritize our needs and spend our existing funds in a smarter way.

No. Forget this policy at this time. Property owners are over-taxed at this time by foolish government spending.

You need to be more specific -- the question is so broad that it's meaningless.

We do not want a "growing region."

What growth?? There are precious few jobs here, in part due to the personal income tax, and I don't see any signs of population growth that would justify large investments based on a dubious forecast of growth.

You need to get with the growth and understand we need more freeway lanes everywhere. Stop trying to pretend we don't. The system is a mess and the worse it's been in 40 years or more.

It is very unclear to me what is innovative about this? Sounds like more internal combustion engines.

Metro is untrustworthy and should not be deciding the fate and affairs of individual communities.

No, because this means a tax increase for someone. How much is being used for light rail, how much for bus service, how much for bike paths, how much for employees, and the like. People are taxed up the wazoo as it is and you want more?
Again, my "no" answer is misleading because of course we need to maintain our infrastructure, but I'm concerned that the wording of this point sounds like supporting business as usual, which is driving as primary means of transportation.

Don't dig into my pocketbook for this funding. You get enough with gas tax!

Mass transit and bicycle/walking makes the most sense long run.

Not if it takes away from other projects.

I'd say YES instead of NO to the whole notion of "more investment" if that "more investment" is being gleaned from current rather than increasing tax sources! Try prioritizing the spending of the revenue being brought in so it goes to maintain and expanding current infrastructure even if it means putting LESS of that revenue into bike paths, beautification projects, or other less important pet projects.

I think we need to look at what we have and how efficiently it is working or not working.

Focus on 21st century solutions instead of putting Bandaids on our antiquated systems.

Current levels are acceptable.

The money is available now but is not managed properly. Unions, PERS, political correctness initiatives suck the coffers dry. Solve those issues first.

Until studded tires are banned there is no reason to increase funding. it would all be damaged after winter anyway.

Addressing climate change seriously must go against the idea of "a growing region". Growth is the problem. Let's not encourage it.

Do not harm small businesses with burdensome high taxes such as pdx new road tax where small businesses would pay a much higher share of tax than residents such as 25 to 30 to 1.

I think someday there will be empty highways because people of the future will work, shop, and attend school from home. Between shootings and contagious disease and overpopulation, people don't want to be in crowded areas. Invest in internet tech, such as city-wide free WiFi instead.

No more taxes and reduce what are in place now.

Taxes!

I believe that we should be given a choice between "repair" and "improvement" in funding choices.

I already pay a monthly street fee to the city of Tualatin. I oppose a Washington County tax because I don't want to pay for streets in Bull Mountain and Aloha. They can join a city and pay for their own. Quit taxing me to death. I think it's time for more of us to move out of this region/state and then what will you do when you are left with only those on the public dole.

Bus yes, light rail no.

Most of these questions sound like adding new taxes.
Actually maybe. History has indicated our regional governments can not be trusted to spend tax money in ways that benefit the mass. They have again and again funded pet projects that benefit the few. Not until our regional governments get their houses in order, I can not support adding additional "funding" for these types of projects.

Not if it emphasizes status quo thinking ie maximum thinking instead of optimum, long-range thinking considering more than transportation for transportation and or transportation planning/planner's sake.

We need an annual license tax on hybrid and electric cars based on mileage to pay their fair share of their use of the roads. We should also stop providing them free recharges at publicly funded facilities, leaving taxpayers to pay the electric bill. That is patently wrong.

We have no money for this. Taxpayers and Businesses are over-taxed already. Have you really looked at how there is no real economic recovery to the middle-class?

Maintain well what we already have. Don't spend anything on making new or bigger roads. Remember, we must make car commuting unpleasant.

I support using funding for what its meant for and not raising taxes any more.

The budgets are sufficiently large, they are just very poorly managed by incompetent managers.

I think we need to get our current growth and new building under control before we add more. Max went in without the communities votes and will cost those neighborhoods more in crime prevention and depletion of property worth. Get that under control first.

Current funds need too be managed wisely before asking for more. Stop wasting money on light rail and street cars.

Stop using the gas taxes for bikes etc. gas taxes should pay for roads only!

This question is phrased in an interesting way. Let's see what we can do to support the objectives within the current funding levels.

Do more with less. Try for efficiency.

This sounds like a bunch of crap. Securing funding? If this refers to borrowing just to maintain things you're out of your minds. If you wish to secure funding for a road or bridge TOLL THE BRIDGE, and when its paid off. TAKE AWAY THE TOLL.

Again, this probably means more taxes and fees. maintenance of roads should be user-funded based on mileage/hours, not another regressive tax.

There is a lot of growth because of infrastructure, e.g. the new SOUTH Hillsboro plans. What's needed is the German model - NO EXPANSION of UGBs.

This question is too vague to give an appropriate answer.
There would be more money available for projects if you reduced the government's overhead & workforce. Businesses have had to deal with reduced budgets during the recession. Government also needs to learn to do so and become more efficient & effective.

Unless this is to support alternative transportation.

What you're really asking about here is additional gas tax or other tax revenue. Absurd to raise taxes when you can easily reduce Oregon's extremely expensive overhead salaries. No wonder we have a funding problem. And by the way, it the ruling few had their way and got half of everyone out of their cars, you would kill your existing revenue source. How can you consider additional taxes, given their harm to people & businesses? We need fewer taxes to stimulate the economy, not more. Live within your means and start spending what you have wisely. It's businesses that creates wealth by turning raw resources into something; and it's government that lives off of taxing that wealth. There needs to be a balance; government takes too much. Study effective economics.

Isn't this just another way to ask if we should provide more roads or bike routes.

Again, these are 2 separate questions. 1. Should we maintain our current infrastructure? Yes. Should we invest in new infrastructure? No. Not until we can ensure that we the current infrastructure can be maintained.

This sounds like an excuse to raise more tax dollars. Do it without raising my taxes!

You have adequate funding. Mothball the Light Rail and put our transportation dollars into roads and maintenance.

Why no road maintenance, but increased property taxes? Mayor Potter had a pothole hot line and the city would fix them in a day or so; now, NOTHING.

We need to have more of our federal gas taxes coming back to Oregon from DC for roads instead of mass transit and bikes.

This question is badly written. De-couple maintenance of existing and new improvements--these are two different funding sources and priorities.

Only if it involves new ideas, new technologies and breaking out of the 100-year-old car-centric cycle.

Our costs are already too high. Plan better, prioritize, take money from inefficient uses and put it towards efficient uses.

Build a better budget. Until government sops wasting money on ridiculous programs like public art and sending money to public schools which have more than enough then I will not allow you to reach into my pocket again and rob me of my hard earned money.

Use what we have with the correct priorities, Peds, human powered, mass transit, carpools/vans, single passenger cars. Can't build your way out of it. The sooner we admit we're addicted to cheap gas and free roads the sooner we can get back to sensible commuting options.
Well of course get funding to support climate goals. But like the technology question, without distinguishing between funded programs this policy emphasis is not very meaningful.

No new roads, at least for awhile. Fix what we have first and invest in better bus, MAX, streetcar service.

I am saying no as I am against the Commissioner Novak's idea re street use tax unless it taxes all ---- including bikes. I also think if there is any big construction projects that do break up the streets, then the construction company should be required to pay or fix the streets in front of their projects. I also think there should be more designated money for only transportation projects to fix streets... not for bike lanes, bioswales, or to help pay for bus tickets for the groups that the city thinks needs help w/ that.

This is a difficult one because I don't have enough information. I'm mostly making a philosophical statement with my "no". I'm wondering why we have a strategy to simply maintain what's existing instead of envisioning what's coming and investing in that. Also, our highway system had an enormously negative impact on many ethnic and low-income communities. How does simply investing in what's existing begin to address those historical impacts. Let's get more innovative than simply maintaining what's existing.

Focus on maintenance of existing system.

Until I see that the governmental agencies care about the people that live in the area for 'new' street planning, I would not vote for any taxes, etc. It just seems that they are catering to the bike riders more and more... plus the new 'yuppie' apartment dwellers, etc.

We only support community "investment"/taxation if the taxation is extremely progressive. No more regressive or flat taxes for any improvements.

This questions is unclear. I support getting adequate funding, but I think it should be spent on safety & equity projects for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders.

Maintenance I support completely. New infrastructure would depend on the project. The Columbia River Crossing, for example, I opposed due to cost. Adding lanes to roads I would generally oppose.

This sounds like a way to divert funds from other sectors of government to spend on roads, or worse, a new bridge to Vancouver. Just raise the tax on Gas I'm all for expensive gas. I would be happy to pay 5-7$/gal of gas if I knew half of those dollars went to active transit, mass transit, public schools, road improvement, healthcare, and traffic law enforcement; in order of most dollars to least dollars.

This seems like the same question asked earlier about widening roads and building more highways. I am in favor of better using the roadways that we have rather than building wider and more roads and highways.

Based on the massive apartment buildings and infill, the region is not growing so why spend money on it?

Accepting and accommodating for a "growing region" will accelerate the current decline of the environment, and will result in a biosphere of supporting life.

No new freeways. Studies on induced demand demonstrate there is little point in new highway construction.

Do not support growth.
I do not support this at this time. This is a future concern, but by its very nature it exists because things are changing and there is no good way to forecast what will be needed based on what we currently know. Portland is densifying. Shopping patterns are changing with a reduction in traffic to big box stores and major malls, and increase in the number of viable neighborhood stores. This is not the time to worry about whether we'll have the funds to keep all the roads the way we want them 10 years from now, when we cannot even say how we will want the roads to be at that time.

Tax businesses for this, not individuals. Certain Oregon counties are already taxed enough--Multnomah County is a prime example! "Accommodating" a growing region often means putting in more roads and cutting into greenspace, which is not the way to go.

I support the money that is currently in the budget being used for maintenance. Please do not pass the street tax.

There's no information about where the money is going to come from. I realize money's not coming in from gas taxes as it once did, so where are you looking to make up the difference? I first want to know what cuts are going to be made before I can give support to this policy. Just because the old funding levels aren't there doesn't mean they were at the right level to begin with. Question the assumption that all the transportation projects on the table are even necessary in the first place. Look to cities such as Paris (not a cheap place by any means) for ideas on how to build a new bridge that suits its environs and was remarkably affordable.

Growth is not always nor forever a good thing. No more highways, no more light rail, no more billion dollar boondoggles. Create a WPA - style work program to fix current bridges and roads, but build no more!

If we need new infrastructure for single occupancy vehicles, we should charge tolls until the money is raised to build it. I especially support tolls for bridges, highways and roads that connect Portland to Clackamas county and Washington state.

We do need a stable funding source however I think we can do a better job with spending the money/resources we already have.

We need to fix the roads, that's a given. gas tax revenues are diminishing because we have more fuel efficient cars. Maybe car registration should be charged by weight. The charge should be directly proportional to the weight of the vehicle and the damage the vehicle is capable of doing to the road. Commercially owned delivery vehicles should be charged triple. Also, Tri-Met and their road destroying buses will also need to be charged.

Not sure what this even means. Status quo? What "improvements" are we talking about?

Again, where the money for this would come from is not being addressed.

Stop the nonsense that growth is necessary and inevitable. Do not make it MORE convenient to move here!
Dwindling funds means making hard choices about how we grow. If biz wants growth they need to pay for it. Region will grow at more reasonable and sustainable rate if road system expansion is slowed down (ie. not subsidized). How can you include "maintenance of existing" and "new improvements" in the same question? These are two separate issues! Maintenance is always important - when you limit heavy vehicles from roadways, the maintenance costs plummet. Consolidate heavy traffic routes and ban studded tires.

Growth should be achieved with increased density.

Just like the private sector does, the public sector needs to figure out how to do more with less through technology and efficiency. The public sector has far more than enough financial resources if it will prioritize spending. NO MORE INCREASING TAXES - YOU HAVE ENOUGH - YOU ARE A GREEDY LOT WITH WASTEFUL SPENDING HABITS.

NO MORE TAXES - in every industry except government people have figured out how to be more efficient, effective, and productive. Government is one of the only sectors that has significant increases in expenses year-after-year, and then complains because they consider "cuts" to be lower increases in spending than they hoped for, rather than actual decreased levels of spending. Enough is enough. Federal income tax revenue collections are at an all time high. I understand that different taxing sources support different functions of government - but perhaps if we quit soaking tax payers with ever increasing taxes and there is less tax revenue, government agencies will be forced to do what the private sector has always done: figure out how to make do with what it has, create win-win alliances with others, reduce waste, etc.

I support maintaining our infrastructure, but new investments need to wait on income improvements from debt reduction, not new spending.

Existing infrastructure should be reformed to be most convenient for non-car users. Funding the transport system as it currently stands is the less sustainable option.

From the depths of my bowels, I cannot believe that a public organization can release a poll that will obviously get certain answers. There's an obvious liberal bent here, but given only the questions asked, people in NY, SF, Texas and Oklahoma would all likely give the same responses. That's because the questions aren't fair. Is the next question "You don't want to do anything bad, do you?"

Ha! secure adequate funding means "get more taxpayer dollars. Stop.

Find money from other government spending.

PDX needs to drop the "street fee". Public opposition will just make it more difficult to pass critical levees in the future. There needs to be a regional solution for road maintenance.

This language is too vague. We should support infrastructure, but not highway expansions like the proposed CRC.
No more roads - just maintain what we have and put the money into transit. Impose a local or regional gas tax to reduce consumption, while simultaneously improving public transit.

City has plenty of money but has spent it inappropriately. There should be no "increased investment" (ie, "new taxes") until current funds are spent wisely and THEN deemed inadequate.

This is vaguely phrased and it could be interpreted many different ways. I do not support maintaining the auto dominated use of Public space. i take transit, bike, skateboard, walk, and drive all in the same week, but only when driving do i feel part of a relatively safe and prioritized network.

Environmental and population trends as the pertain to resource conservation and pollution avoidance.

Tri-Met should be a more active participant in improving their service/quality/cost.

Not if it means more highways and capital investment in car-centric infrastructure.

Any road updates should be road diets.

I can't support this statement as phrased. Too vague and probably auto-oriented.

Maintenance yes. Limit growth so that new infrastructure is not needed.

I don't think that we should increase the amount of spending until the priorities of what we will spend the money on will be. for example widening 217 or spending $400 Million to widen I-5 through the rose quarter are projects that could be easily cut and the money used to promote more sustainable transportation types.

My perception is that you have adequate funding but don't spend/invest wisely. Taxpayers are NOT a bottomless pit.

We DO NOT need more transportation money - we need to quit wasting it on toy transit, streetcars, speed bumps, bubble curbs and a whole host of other useless schemes.

There should be a consistent and fervent effort from local officials to collect more taxes from people who are choosing to drive, whether it be through a local gas tax, a vehicle-mileage-tax (VMT) or otherwise. Providing infrastructure for motor vehicles is extremely expensive and should be treated as a luxury, not a right.

Get the existing transit system working better and more efficiently before investing in new infrastructure, regardless of how "sexy " those projects may be.

I really waffled on this one. obviously if the region will be growing we need to accommodate the transportation needs this will bring. However I am not a fan of growth for growth's sake. I like Portland the size it is. Rush hour traffic is already getting pretty bad. let's not aspire to have the traffic headaches Seattle has.

Transportation that plans for growth only facilitates even more growth.
From what I've learned, a large portion of the cost of gas is due to taxes and fees. Far too often these days, it seems as though "Sin-taxing" is en vogue - rather than taking a reasonable tax to account for things that are actually being done, taxes are being inflicted upon groups that are not living up to some arbitrarily decided ideal (with the funds being funneled off to pet projects - sometimes completely unrelated to their source - instead of to the repair/maintenance of the what is actually needed/essential.

Use money that's in the system better, rather than force-feeding expensive "improvements" that don't get used.

NO!!! YOU HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING!!!

I am not in favor of the first proposed tax to drive. It is not progressive. I would like the funds that are supposed to be for the roads be for the cars. Period. Find another source to fund bike lanes. I ride a bike license them. The other reason they need to be licensed is to learn to ride responsibly. There are a lot of dangerous cyclists out there. I have almost been hit while walking on the sidewalks of Portland more times than I can count. That is not acceptable to have an entitled group not be responsible.

Make better use of the funds we have if needed make the users pay.

Not until you charge people tolls and parking fees to use the existing infrastructure. If we give you more money you'll build more FREE CAPACITY, and exacerbate the problem.

Job prosperity before more development.

Do not fund bad growth, more cars, more fossil fuel use by dumping money into bad transportation infrastructure. Encourage smart growth, Bike, walk, trains, bus, street car, light rail. Re-design large parts of Portland that really are based on 1950's planning principles.

Retrofit our bridges and maintain what we have, but don't build more roads or freeways.

I support more investment in terms of real wages for employees, and higher taxes on corporations like FedEx and UPS (companies that use our streets and roads every single day to ship their product) to maintain the existing infrastructure.

I think the transportation infrastructure could use an overhaul. I'm not an urban planning expert, but it seems like fewer cars is a step in the right direction. If that means creating fewer roads, ok with me. But careful planning, building bike paths, and maintaining what we have takes money. Everyone should pay a share based on income.

Depends on what "implementing" this entails. If it's in the form of a flat tax -- vehicle registration fees, etc. -- then that's awful. Low- and mid-income folks are increasingly burdened with the costs of governmental work. The top 30% of individuals and / or all mid- to large businesses should be helping to carry this weight.

Unless these funds are used to improve our alternative transport infrastructure projects.
Again, we should already be budgeting for the maintenance of our infrastructure. I'm not sure why I am being asked this question because if we were managing our funds well, we would be setting aside a pot of money to do it already. This is where safety of our roadways should fall. If you are talking about growing the infrastructure to be ready for future urban growth, then yes, we should invest in this. It is inevitable.

IF you are talking of more rail, NO.

Monies should come from increasing gas taxes, thereby funding comes from those using the roads most.

We already pay enough in taxes. Use the money better. Don't build super expensive light rail but use the money for more cost effective public transit and road maintenance.

NO NEW TAXES< USER FEES until you can account for Prudent expenditures with what you have.

Not sure your reasoning is sound on this one.

Only if the investment results in more private vehicle capacity in highways and interstates. No more light rail.

I don't support this because it sounds like get more money for highways and hiding it behind the rationale that reducing auto congestion is good for climate.

Maintaining current is important but not encouraging sprawl by adding more roads.

There are sufficient funds if they are spent wisely.

Blanket, black-and-white statement. I DO support necessities, I DON'T support the further tailoring of our world to revolve around our vehicles.

Infrastructure is a primary function of government. This is not something that needs consideration...it needs to just be done.

I said "No" because the implication is that you're going to do things like you've always done since 1950: continually expanding the ROAD and HIGHWAY network, which is, again, completely backward! Vancouver, BC, is North America's ONLY city without a highway cutting through its heart, and it's continually ranked either the very most or nearly the most livable city in the entire world. By increasing the bike mode share from a paltry 6% at best to 25% or more, we can save $BILLIONS in road maintenance costs!! Plus, we'll save $billions on top of that in health care costs! Also, STRESS levels will absolutely plunge, and creativity will skyrocket! I always have my MOST creative thoughts when I'm biking or walking *not in car traffic*. The improvements in every single area of civic life (obviously *quality of life* being a key general area) will improve exponentially if we can at least quadruple the bike mode share in Portland. It's VERY possible to do, too! We have the second-highest percentage of land devoted to streets of any city in the entire U.S., regardless of size! If we were to devote just 5% of street space to bikes (and protected the lanes with physical barriers from cars!), we'd become Amsterdam (the greatest city I have ever visited) overnight!

Concentrate on spending current dollar revenue in a more efficient way. The answer is always proposed to 'increase revenue.' That's very rarely the solution.
If "regional transportation solution" is defined as more light rail, then No. Why not ask a fee from all bicyclers who mix it up with traffic daily. If they participate in an accident and just drive away you have no means of tracking them. Licensing fees would add to the coffers. If you want to play you have to pay.

Portland/Metro/Tri-Met have long and storied histories of squandering public resources on pet projects at the expense of taking care of the basics (like street maintenance). Not one more dime to them until they can demonstrate some degree of prioritization and fiscal responsibility.

"New improvements" to you means more MAX. Again, I am opposed.

I don't want to live in a neo-Californian Portland.

I only support an increase if currents funds are spent in a fiscally responsible way. Creating concrete bike lanes when asphalt would work (Multnomah Blvd) is not fiscally responsible. Redoing adequate roads and sidewalks in Multnomah Village is not fiscally responsible.

In theory, I do support this value--but am distrustful of how costs would be distributed.

Don't build new shit if you can't afford to maintain what you have. Common sense that hasn't been demonstrated at all by metro (park land) and the city of portland (streets).

We have already done this- max and street car. If anything you need security on max- it's dagerouse with drugs and crime I have seen it.

Total Waste of Money.

This is not the first priority among public funding needs.

Not more investment -- more taxes, especially on the suburban business communities (Intel, Nike, etc.) that benefit most transport infrastructure.

Nothing new until all streets are paved!

Again, a dishonest, cleverly worded attempt to garner votes for further punishing drivers. You could at least be clear about what you're actually asking. But of course then you wouldn't get the votes you need to "prove" that your already decoded on discriminatory policies are supported by the public.

We are overtaxed as it is for the few people that bike in our rainy climate. Take that money and make driving safer.

Nimby.

Maintenance should go first and only expand roads when other options (including the improvements in the other policies) do not prove adequate.

I do no support additional fees or taxes, especially on households or property, personal; vehicles and small truck. Heavy trucks and buses cause a disproportionate amount of damage to the roads and must be accountable for the damage they cause. If this means that everyone pays through higher transportation costs for goods, so be it.

More cars mean more headaches.
Catch 22: add more bike lanes, more light rail and bus infrastructure to address the points noted in the "more information" section...but unfortunately that decreases "some" of the revenue as noted. Balance is needed in favor of cars now, wider roads for them, express lanes and those that have to use a car will be paying more of the gas taxes. The money in past that was earmarked in state and local funds for roads and maintenance should never have been used for a multitude other projects, so those funds should be designated by law as untouchable and used for roads only. Barriers such as freeway dividers is another area of wasteful spending. Example: concrete dividers are ugly, yes but does the job of protection from cars/trucks crossing over to oncoming traffic, but the wire type ones were chosen along the I-5 (Wilsonville for example) cost more money. Reliable sources say that environmentalists favored as they were less obtrusive and provided a more open view. I think the biggest factor annoying the public is "pet projects", and lack of common sense in spending money, or who is chosen to provide the service without proper vetting.

We already pay for the infrastructure.

You have mis-managed the infrastructure for decades, now you want us to pony up more money so you can catch up? I don't trust you enough to add more money to your misspent coffers! There are so many mis managed bureaus in our city that it's not conceivable you should be given more money to waste!

Live within your means, like the public has to.

Stop growing - it's a false desire and leads towards resource depletion. Enough is enough.

Metro has placed undo burden on residents to maintain costly rail lines that only serve limited areas and that are sensitive to heat and cold. They have totally shut down all rail lines due to maintenance, accidents and breakdowns. New trains for PDX-Milw. will be different than the current trains and may need different maintenance. Buses will best accommodate new growth when and where as needed regardless of heat, cold, weather, accidents, etc.

Only if they make good sense - the Columbia River Crossing project disaster should not be repeated - how do you intend to prevent it?

Stop wasting our money on economically unsustainable projects.

Why can't the "new resident" tax base take care of expansion? Why do I have to pay more just because more people move in? It's as if we don't understand basic math.

I support the appropriate investment for maintenance and growth, not necessarily more. I think we pay for the maintenance already, by paying more in taxes how do I know it will not be spent on port-a-potties?

The main issue here is let the voters in the region decide, period. Government isn't smarter, or more of a visionary than the taxpayer, let the people in our democracy VOTE. Then respect the voters outcome.

More investment from the community equals higher taxes. My taxes are high enough.
STOP TRYING TO COME UP WITH NEW WAYS TO STEAL MONEY! You think the people are stupid and don't recognize this for what it is - NO NEW TAXES! The gas tax is plenty for you. Use it more wisely. Stop wasting gas tax transportation dollars on excessive schemes that do not directly benefit roads. (enough parks, wetlands, bike paths, city center aids, etc).

The only new improvements should be how to limit car use and promote active transportation.

As a community grows, there are more taxpayers, so the cost of maintaining the roads should not be increasing when measured as the cost per taxpayer, driver, or household. If government will stop playing shell games by shifting money away from road maintenance and spending it on other pet "transportation" projects like bike paths, light rail, and other "feel good" projects, there would be sufficient money available for road maintenance and improvement that would help far more people. WES is an example of BAD GOVERNMENT. Every time the train goes by, I see more people held up by the train at an intersection than are actually on the train. WES is a rolling roadblock stopping thousands of people every trip, while moving dozens, at a loss of over $50,000 per month!

I work with the construction industry and see massive amounts of waste, this should be fixed before asking for more money. Some current policies like prevailing wage jobs are wasting tax payer money.

Maintenance is crucial. However, you have failed to explain what the sources would be. Washington County is a leader in this realm, and residents of that county should not be punished for other jurisdictions inability to approve funding. While we should coordinate for state and federal funding (even that leads to problems with establishing regional priorities), by no means should we consider a regional tax.

Minimal maintenance, minimal accommodations for growth.

Not quite sure what this means...is this for roads or bike paths or mass transit?

Taxes, gas and otherwise, should be used for prioritized services. Transportation is one of those priorities so use the dollars that have already been provided.

Again, I worry that this description is used as an excuse to enlarge the fossil fuel portion of our transportation system.

Increase tax revenue based upon vmt--traditionally gas tax. To much of the revenue comes from RE tax. This does not encourage non-auto use.

Not if it means higher taxes.

As the region grows and the economy expands, additional resources will be available without additional taxing (the source of the investments referred to in the question) and those should be used to fund any expansion.
You had me going at maintain existing then you had to throw in and NEW... new means we don't need it and thats what you will focus on ... Not maintenance which is the primary responsibility of government... protect the people and provide for the transportation of good and services... ANd you all are doing a horrible job at that.

Reduce the tendency to build more and bigger facilities that encourage single occupancy vehicles. Maintain what we have, and only increase roads/road size as an absolute last resort.

Cost.

You are wasting the gas taxes now. why should we waste more?

This is a political stab at finding more funds. Do you know where the gas tax goes? Not to the roads where it was intended. Quit looking for additional taxes. Use the funds you already take for the purpose they are intended. Then, if that isn't enough for you, you can raise those specific fund generating sources as long as it is for the task intended. Fix this part of the broken tax system by not playing smoke and mirrors with public dollars. Use funds for what they were intended.

There was a time too long ago when people who traveled payed their way. One payed tolls to use bridges or improved roads. Those using railroads to move about or ship freight payed the railroad companies enough so they were profitable and paid taxes...they were not subsidized. Be it river traffic, airlines, transit, trucks and autos /we need to go back to this way of thinking.

Maintain - yes. But set a very high barrier to expand the wrong infrastructure. Low-carbon transportation options need more focus.

Growth by definition is not sustainable. Implement necessary gas/carbon tax.

I am really afraid any yes on these questions will be misused to justify higher taxes. It's okay to rearrange priorities to increase funding for more sensible expenditures.

Policy needs to be more focused on reducing pollution of all types and making wise growth options -- how about new areas with no auto traffic?

Find ways to discourage growth in our region.

Use the funds, gas tax dollars, for their original purpose and the problem is solved. Find the financial sources to support the other programs that have been associated with the gas tax. And don't act as if you don't know what I'm talking about.

Too many taxes already. Let's be honest, you are suggesting new taxes and fees. If the expense can't be met, then don't build it. What a ridiculous argument - We want people driving less and using less gas, but when we are successful, we can't get as much tax money to squander.

If you need more resources (Tax Collections) put it to a vote of the people.

Existing infrastructure only.
Looking just at property owners to support roads... What about all those commuters from Vancouver, Wa that don't pay for the roads they drive on.

Yes, and No - I don't think people that are hardly driving or using the infrastructure should be burdened with the cost of it. So, maybe the heavy users should pay? Can streets etc. be considered a "common good"? Not sure where the dollars need to come from, but maybe a tax or fee should be requested from the people wanting to move here?

This sounds like a new tax, how about cutting spending.

Budget better chose priorities. No new taxes.

Not actually sure. Even after reading the additional explanation, it's not clear what long term sources you'd be securing, where that money comes from, etc.

I support only maintaining existing transportation infrastructure.

I do not support increasing the width of freeways.. etc. Maintain streets but remind people of the hassle of driving if they CAN take transit and encourage them to do so.

Sounds to me like repaving projects under a different name. Dislike.

Since accommodating a growing region seems to involve expanding the Max, I cannot support this policy. Here in Milwaukie, we were very clear that we do not want Max here but our voice apparently did not matter.

Get back to basics. Pave all the streets in Portland first. Portland should stop giving Portland Public Schools $8 million per year to start. PPS needs to pay for schools itself.

Far too much insider dealing. Look at the "engineering" fee paid out on the "planning" for the failed CRC. What an eye opener. There are those who have learned that the easiest way to legally steal is to become a friendly vendor who finances the campaigns of those who happen to make decisions on construction projects. It stinks.

Stop building up and allow the rest of the state to grow at its own pace.

Make developers pay for the infrastructure.

I don't believe more taxes are needed. The money provided by the gas tax should be enough and dedicated to transportation investments.

I believe we should dramatically shift funding away from mass transit systems, especially fixed rail, to provide better road infrastructure for the vehicles of the future.

I support eliminating unnecessary current spending and re-allocating it to road maintenance. There is plenty of money from tax payers already in the coffers, spend it more wisely.

Planning for yesterday tomorrow. Using vaulable resouces with bad results has been the hallmark of these agencies.

"Secure adequate funding" is NewSpeak for More Taxes. Do it with what you have, and outsource more competitively.
Again this is in the budget and to ask for more money to do what has been allocated is wrong. The fastest way to lose any support is to misrepresent how money is being allocated. New improvements for a growing region should be a separate issue.

Balance the transportation budget where it is now. Don't ask or take any more taxes from the people. We don't have anymore to give.

Stop inflating the population growth estimates. Also- who wrote this stupid question?

NO MORE LIGHT RAIL. YES TO ROAD IMPROVEMENTS FOR INDIVIDUAL TRANSPORTION ie CARS.

Only support maintenance of existing infrastructure.

"Secure adequate funding" is NewSpeak for More Taxes. Do it with what you have, and outsource more competitively.

A growing region means growth in revenue because we pay a sales tax to pay for our roads. Manage the money get competitive with those who contract for the labor of our roads!

Don't bundle "maintenance" with expansion.

I support eliminating unnecessary current spending and re-allocating it to road maintenance There is plenty of money from tax payers already in the coffers, spend it more wisely.

Safety for all users before anything else. We need bike lanes that ensure I won't be killed by a car driver before we need potholes fixed. We need intersections that aren't a mile wide before we need new lanes added. Cars are not king.

Not if it means increasing taxes or fees.

Sounds like political talk for "Can we raise taxes and fees because we can't manage money properly?" So no.

Stop all the rail/streetcar spending and we'll be fine.

Maintenance only not for fossil fuel growth. No more taxes. Note: survey cut off no. 6.

If people drive less should the road require less work? Perhaps some roads should have tolls to help with maintenance?

Gas tax and car plats.

I am not sure. I would like to see more investment in better more successful changes in what we already have rather than band-aiding the old. IE a new efficient Interstate bridge!

Install booth-less congestion tolls to provide incentives for people to use mass transit during rush hour while still giving them the option to use their cars if they are willing to pay the price, as is being done in London and Stockholm.

Improvements? That's a loaded word. For crying out loud, we're not the first city in the world. There are models all over the place on how to reduce reliance on motorized vehicles. "Improvement" would mean fewer people making fewer trips.
Don't understand the question. I support investment in some parts of the transportation infrastructure, but not others.

Another hard one. Maintenance of existing corridors I don't have a problem with. I would want to know more about the ideas around new improvements... most new improvements I've ever experienced have not been that great.

I support changing or replacing the gas tax. But the explanation does not provide alternatives.

Emphasis on expanding biking and public transport infrastructure.

Make infrastructure maintenance and street repair a priority.

Why not index the gas taxes to inflation? Why not have gasoline prices increased to pay for these? We already have cheap gas, compared to the rest of the world. Automobile use drops dramatically when gas prices go up--which is really a benefit in the long run, no?

Seems like these questions are filled with jargon that someone at a planning conference would find interesting, . But where's the vision for the vibrant community we would all like to live in?

Ensure it's an equitable tax. Do not just single out groups like homeowners. Include bicycle riders as paying users.

Build just enough consensus- someone will object to any tax. Speaking as a lifetime bike and transit user, the city's approach comes off as faddish and flashy, not substantial when they try to get bike share, dedicated bike lanes in the wrong places, etc.

Yes, but the growth should not encourage additional automobiles. Car sharing and car sharing services should be encouraged to continue to try to reduce the number of cars on the road at any given time.

Current fuel tax should provide for maintenance.

Encourage job growth in infrastructure maintenance.

"Increases physical activity, Reduces air pollution and air toxics?" How does building a road increase physical activity? Or reduce air pollution? People in China bike and walk and have terrible pollution.

Eliminate new light rail builds. Improve, widen and expand roadways and highways. Improving car traffic flow will reduce pollution much faster and to a far greater degree than all mass transit. People will not give up their cars, so plan according to that reality!

It depends on whether these can be covered without paving the whole countryside or making motor vehicles from dominate everything. The whole transportation infrastructure includes working toward fewer motor vehicles.

If you're going to levy a tax to replace less available funding from gas taxes, please consider which users cause the most damage to the infrastructure and figure out a way to make those who cause the most damage pay the higher tax.

It depends on how this will be financed. Bike riders need to be licensed.
Remember that the financial pot is not bottomless. be careful how the money is spent.

accommodating growth is more than working on the major streets. this might mean new policies. For instance, when a city incorporates an area, they need to take responsibility for the existing infrastructure at a minimum. This means maintaining streets that may not be up to standard and planning a way for them to be brought up to standard without imposing large fees on the folks that have living in that location -- just because the city does not want to take responsibility for its new infrastructure.

this question doesn't make sense to me. of course funding is needed for projects. but what is the plan to secure that funding? how is that plan different from before? and how does securing funding possibly reduce air pollution and traffic fatalities (there must be some steps missing here)? this topic seems so all-over-the-place.

Maintenance of existing- limited expansion.

Gas tax preferred over random street tax that doesn't account for the myriad of drivers from outside the city/region.

Questions should be more specific.

Ways of making improvements without requiring more space.

Please toll. Congestion pricing.