

Oregon Department of Transportation
and Metro

Regional Mobility Policy Update

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW REPORT

Prepared by JLA Public Involvement

10/23/2019



Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that requires that no person be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance.

Metro fully complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act that requires that no otherwise qualified individual with a disability be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination solely by reason of their disability under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance. If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536.

Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1700 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at trimet.org

Metro is the federally mandated metropolitan planning organization designated by the governor to develop an overall transportation plan and to allocate federal funds for the region.

The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) is a 17-member committee that provides a forum for elected officials and representatives of agencies involved in transportation to evaluate transportation needs in the region and to make recommendations to the Metro Council. The established decision-making process assures a well-balanced regional transportation system and involves local elected officials directly in decisions that help the Metro Council develop regional transportation policies, including allocating transportation funds.

Project website: www.oregonmetro.gov/mobility

The preparation of this strategy was financed in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this strategy are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

Contents

- 1.0 Introduction.....1
 - 1.1 Background1
 - 1.2 Purpose of the Interviews.....1
 - 1.3 Process1
- 2.0 Summary of Major Messages2
- 3.0 Summary by Question5
 - 3.1 Define Mobility5
 - Common responses:5
 - 3.2 Interviewees’ Background on the existing policy6
 - Policy makers’ and Community/Business Representatives’ Familiarity with the existing policy6
 - Practitioners’ use of the existing policy6
 - 3.3 Strengths and Weaknesses of the Existing Policy and System7
 - Policy Makers’ Perspectives on the Existing System7
 - Community and Business Representatives’ Perspectives on the existing system.....9
 - Practitioners’ use of the existing policy10
 - 3.4 Thinking About Potential Alternative Measures of Mobility11
 - Policy Makers’ Recommended Measures.....12
 - Business and Community Representatives’ Recommended Measures.....13
 - Practitioners’ Recommended Measures15
 - 3.5 Consistency/Flexibility of Policy, Measures, and Targets17
 - Policy Makers on Policy Consistency/Flexibility17
 - Community And Business Representatives on Policy Consistency/Flexibility18
 - Practitioners on Policy Consistency/Flexibility19
 - 3.6 Accessibility, Safety, Equity, and Other Modes20
 - Policy Makers’ Perspectives on Accessibility, Safety, Equity, and Other Modes.....20

| | |
|---|----|
| Community and Business Representatives’ Perspectives on Accessibility, Safety, Equity, and Other Modes..... | 21 |
| Practitioners’ perspectives on Equity | 22 |
| 3.7 Managing for Project Success..... | 23 |
| Policy Makers..... | 23 |
| Community and Business Representatives..... | 24 |
| Practitioners | 24 |
| 3.8 Project Process and Future Engagement..... | 25 |
| Interest in Future Engagement..... | 25 |
| Individuals and/or Organizations to Include in Future Engagement | 25 |
| Messaging and Project Communication | 25 |
| Suggested Informational Tools..... | 26 |
| 4.0 Key Challenges to Address in the Update Process | 26 |
| Appendix A: List of Stakeholders Interviewed | 29 |
| Appendix B: Suggested Engagement | 31 |
| Appendix C: Suggested Informational Tools..... | 32 |

1.0 Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) are working together to review and revise the policy on how the region defines and measures mobility in regional and local transportation system plans (TSPs) and during the local plan amendment process in the Portland area. The updated policy will guide development of future regional and local transportation plans and the evaluation of potential impacts of plan amendments and zoning changes on the transportation system.

The current 20-year old mobility policy is adopted in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Policy 1F (Highway Policy) of the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP), and measures the ratio of motor vehicle volume to motor vehicle capacity during peak travel periods to identify transportation needs and adequacy of the transportation system to serve planned land uses. These thresholds are referred to as the volume-to-capacity ratio (v/c ratio).

This project to update the Regional Transportation Plan's 20-year old "interim" mobility policy was identified in the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as necessary to better align the mobility policy with the comprehensive set of shared regional values, goals and desired outcomes identified in the RTP and 2040 Growth Concept, as well as with local and state goals.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEWS

This planning effort is in the scoping phase. Policy makers, business and community representatives, and transportation and land use practitioners (consultants and city/county/ regional/state/federal staff) were interviewed with the purpose of understanding how they define mobility, as well as to collect insights as to their desired outcomes from the update to the current mobility policy. Additionally, interviewees were asked to share the challenges and opportunities they see or experience related to the region's mobility and/or the mobility policy.

The feedback from these interviews supplements other project scoping engagement activities conducted by ODOT and Metro since April 2019, and have been used to help develop both a work plan and public engagement plan for consideration by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council that will guide the planning process as the project moves forward in 2020.

1.3 PROCESS

Stakeholders from a mix of interests and experience were interviewed to ensure a wide range of viewpoints and perspectives, including:

- Elected officials and policy makers from the Metro Council, Land Conservation and Development Commission and the Oregon Transportation Commission, commissioners from each of the three counties (Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington), and public officials from TriMet, ODOT, and Metro
- Staff transportation and land use practitioners from all three counties, as well as from ODOT Region 1, the Federal Highway Administration, Port of Portland, Department of Land Conservation and Development, and from select cities within the Portland area

- Transportation and land use consultants or experts from DKS Associates, Kittelson and Associates, Angelo Planning, WSP, and Radler White Parks & Alexander. LLP
- Business, economic development, freight, and trade representatives
- Community representatives from a variety of backgrounds and organizations ranging from equity, environmental justice, sustainability/environmental protection, transit/bike/pedestrian advocacy, seniors and disability rights, and transportation advocacy

A total of 64 people were interviewed in person or by phone from July to September of 2019, with a total of 10 group interviews and 31 individual interviews. For a full list of the stakeholders involved in these interviews, refer to **Appendix A**.

Interviewees were asked to answer a series of questions with topics ranging from personal or agency-specific definitions of mobility, potential measures of mobility, application of the policy, as well as mobility as it relates to equity, safety, and other modes of transportation. Questions varied depending on the level of experience or expertise the interviewee had in regards to the current mobility policy. Interviewers also asked for suggestions on the public engagement process for the mobility policy update.

This document summarizes the results of those interviews.

2.0 Summary of Major Messages

- **Broad support and enthusiasm expressed for an updated policy.** While suggestions or preference for how to update the policy varied, all interviewees expressed support, and most expressed enthusiasm, for updating and adapting the mobility policy to better serve the region.
- **Develop a broader, more holistic mobility policy.** Nearly all interviewees supported developing a mobility policy that is not just vehicle based and does not just measure volume/capacity. Interviewees suggested a number of ways the policy could be more holistic including expanding the policy to include all modes, applying an equity lens, and taking into account safety, accessibility, network connectivity, connectivity between modes, and system completion.
- **Ensure the new policy is legally defensible and not overly complex.** The primary value of the current policy is that it is widely understood and accepted by those to whom it applies. It is regional, it is legally defensible for plan amendments and development review because it has been tested over time, and it is relatively easy to explain and apply. Jurisdictions, in particular, are concerned that a complex policy can lead to confusion, a lack of accountability or use in decision-making, and further barriers to development and transportation improvements.
- **The current policy, standards and measures are insufficient or not working:**
 - Most jurisdictions and transportation consultants noted that, given our growth and funding constraints, it is not always possible to meet the policy and standards; therefore the policy has decreased in its impact on planning. While it may help prioritize projects for the TSPs, it is not realistic to assume additional capacity required to meet the policy will actually be funded, or that vehicle capacity is appropriate in all situations.
 - All jurisdictions and many community stakeholders agreed that the policy does not recognize or take into account opportunities for moving people and goods by other modes, and can inhibit investments that promote use of travel options, such as walking, biking, and use of transit.

- Many policy makers, community members, and staff of other jurisdictions pointed out that the policy is dated and does not address other goals of the region, such as climate change, public health, equity, and housing.
- **A policy with one set of measures, but different targets:** Most interviewees felt the policy and measures should remain the same regardless of land use context or type of road, but were supportive of developing a toolkit for applying the measures and assigning targets in a way that considers the planned land uses in an area and/or the function of the road. Many participants were undecided about *how* the application of the measures and assigned targets should differ, but a large majority expressed that a “one-size-fits-all” approach was not appropriate. There was general support for having a policy that had a consistent set of measures and:
 - Applying different targets for more urbanized areas with more travel options available versus the developing areas that have fewer options; and/or
 - Applying different targets and/or measures based on the purpose or function of the facility (eg. throughways and freight routes versus arterials).

A few stakeholders suggested the policy’s measures and targets should be applied uniformly, with the expectation that all of the region should be developed to ultimately support the land use and transportation goals of the region.

- **Most commonly suggested measures:**
 - Travel time and reliability
 - Easily understood by the public
 - Supports the freight industry
 - May be more effective than v/c for systems that cannot meet v/c targets
 - Transit coverage and frequency
 - Can be linked to bike and pedestrian network completion
 - Supports transit dependent populations, but needs to consider paratransit and deviated routes
 - Helps reduce the need to drive, drive alone trips, and vehicle miles traveled
 - Safety
 - Needs to be included either as a part of measuring mobility, or included as a separate measure
 - Access to destinations
 - Include first/last mile connectivity to transit from jobs, housing, and other destinations (e.g., 20-minute neighborhoods)
 - Promotes mobility for all modes and complete communities
 - Can help meet equity goals
 - Network connectivity
 - Can be applied on both a large and small scale (e.g., system-level and plan amendment scales)
 - Needs to have a defined and agreed-upon network before setting as a measure
 - Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
 - Look to California as a guide
 - May help achieve other goals, such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions and equity goals
 - Difficult to defensibly measure, may only work at the system level
 - Volume to capacity (v/c)
 - Too simplistic to be the only measure

- Useful for identifying issues in the system
 - Can help with vehicle movement which benefits the economy
 - Provides legally defensible data
- **Significant support for an equitable transportation system, but no agreement on what that is or how to accomplish it.** Generally, most define an equitable system as one that serves all people with safe, reliable, efficient, and affordable options, especially for those with the most need in order to access affordable housing, jobs, and services.
 - Many stress that to achieve this we should invest where there are identified communities with the most need.
 - Many others stress that multimodal investments intended for equity are now serving the young, white privileged population. Housing affordability and other factors have contributed to displacement, dispersing communities of color and low income residents to outer areas of the region with fewer options to find affordable housing. They are now car dependent so vehicle capacity is an equity issue.
 - Others point out that historically marginalized communities will continue to move in the region, and that the best way to serve them is to ensure sufficient transportation choices throughout the region.

Note: Each of these perspectives was raised by a variety of interviewees representing the spectrum of stakeholders, including those representing historically marginalized and underserved communities.

- **Align with the current uses of the mobility policy.** This update should aim to sync up the full range of uses of the current policy, including development review and project design.
- **The most common success factors mentioned by stakeholders were:**
 - A more holistic approach to measuring mobility
 - More carrot, less stick approach to reducing VMT
 - A policy that uses an equitable and culturally responsive approach, specifically in regards to how the transportation system supports historically marginalized and vulnerable communities as they relate to social and demographic identity
 - Implementation – the policy will be broadly supported and adopted by all jurisdictions and used
 - Reduction of congestion
- **Comments on the update process and stakeholder engagement:**
 - Engage typical users
 - Engage stakeholders from outside the region that travel through the region or to key destinations in the region (e.g., Portland International Airport, freight intermodal facilities, universities, hospitals, etc.)
 - Look to California’s work on VMT measures, call on experts that worked on developing that legislation and implementation at regional and local levels
 - Work with representatives from underserved communities to define an equitable transportation system
 - Provide opportunities for practitioners from jurisdictions across the region to learn about each other’s needs in building a new policy

3.0 Summary by Question

This section is broken down by question, as well as by the type of interviewee (policy makers, community and business representatives, and transportation and land use practitioners). The icons below can help identify the type of interviewee responses that are being summarized.

Policy Makers



Community and Business Representatives



Transportation and Land Use Practitioners



3.1 DEFINE MOBILITY

Policy makers and community/business representatives were asked: **“What does the term “mobility” mean to you in the context of a community?”**

COMMON RESPONSES:

The definitions volunteered by interviewees generally fell into one of the following two related categories:

- *All transportation system users can access their destinations – home, work, services – in a timely, efficient, and affordable way by their choice of mode.*
- *Movement of goods and people.*

VARIATIONS AND ADDITIONAL POINTS:

- Flexibility in the system
- How the system handles the volume of all movement
- How transportation and mobility contributes to livability
- Transportation that is responsive to individual needs
- Proximity as it relates to and promotes mobility
- People-centered transportation
- Mobility is broader and more complex than just congestion
- Transportation is not an end, but a means to an end for healthy, engaged, and successful communities
- “Isn’t transportation for transportation’s sake”

3.2 INTERVIEWEES' BACKGROUND ON THE EXISTING POLICY



POLICY MAKERS' AND COMMUNITY/BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES' FAMILIARITY WITH THE EXISTING POLICY

Policy makers and community/business representatives were asked: **“Are you familiar with the current regional mobility policy?”**

- Most community members did not have former experience with the mobility policy and some felt that, based on the factsheet and information they were provided, they would not be qualified to participate. However, following encouragement and gaining an understanding that the interview would be based more on values than technical knowledge, they were more comfortable and eager to voice their perspective.
- A majority of policy makers were familiar with the mobility policy and its purpose, but not with the specifics or general application. *Note: Some had a significant depth of knowledge on the policy due to their history and/or responsibilities.*



PRACTITIONERS' USE OF THE EXISTING POLICY

The transportation and land use practitioners (transportation agency staff and consultants) were asked: **“How do you/does your agency use the current regional mobility policy, standards and targets?”**

Note: This does not provide details on how each interviewee uses the policy, but represents the range of responses.

The practitioners noted they use the policy and standards in the context of their TSPs, plan amendments, development review, projects, federal NEPA process to define purpose, establishing alternative mobility standards, and TPR compliance.

- The policy can help identify problems and prioritize road projects at the system level.
- Most stated that it is not a useful tool or else that it is not an adequate planning tool, and that it's becoming less and less viable. They pointed out that the standards are frequently not achievable and/or are not helpful for creating TSPs that meet today's goals of multimodal plans and walkable neighborhoods.
- Practitioners pointed out that they will move forward with planning even when it is a challenge to meet the policy:
 - TSPs – local jurisdictions will prioritize local projects, but for facilities that are subject to the standards and requirements of the policy, jurisdictions will often defer the problem by referring to the need for a refinement study.
 - Plan amendments – in order to meet the policy in their plans, practitioners will often create a “polite fiction” and include projects that have a low likelihood of getting built or funded.
 - Development review – when a development proposal is submitted that doesn't meet the mobility standards, but is not expected to receive significant opposition and is supported by the jurisdiction, the jurisdiction will make a calculated risk and approve the proposal with the assumption that there won't be an appeal.

- There's a disconnect between mobility for travel through the region and mobility as it relates to access and safety.
- The TSPs need to be manipulated in order to meet the demands of the policy.
- The table of mobility standards and targets is a precise measuring tool in an imprecise environment.
- The policy still works for smaller MPOs and the jurisdictions outside the Metro area.
- The current policy can impede planned development, particularly new housing, and the implementation of the Beavercreek Concept Plan in Oregon City was held up as an example by several interviewees.
- The TSPs are required by the TPR to coordinate land use and transportation planning. When planners are not able to adequately reconcile the planned land use and transportation within the TSP, it pushes the responsibility to meet the mobility policy down the line to the plan amendment and then development review.
- Practitioners that are responsible for healthy industry noted that it is helpful in development review and capital projects for understanding third party impacts to adjacent businesses.
- It is used as a basis for requesting exceptions.
- One jurisdiction stated that they feel the policy has been successful and they continue to use it to plan for and build out their system.
- The mobility policy can pose an issue during jurisdictional transfers, such as Barbur Blvd. or 82nd Ave.
- In TSPs it is used to identify needs and priorities.
- The designation of a mixed-use multimodal area (MMA) is not fully utilized because of the City of Portland Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) requirements. Due to past practices, there have been changes at the local level that take advantage of what the MMA designation allows. However, the City of Portland has not updated their local master plan process to remove the requirement for additional traffic analysis.

3.3 STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE EXISTING POLICY AND SYSTEM



POLICY MAKERS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE EXISTING SYSTEM

Policy makers were asked **“When thinking about mobility, what do you believe is working/not working with the current system?”**

WHAT'S WORKING

- The policy is consistent between state and regional plans.
- There has been a lot of community and regional discussion about how to address mobility issues, and efforts have been made to develop solutions.
- The hub and spoke transit model was effective when building out the initial system.
- In regards to plan amendments:
 - The policy forces a conversation that ensures the community understands the implications of decisions – it doesn't force compliance, but builds understanding and support.
 - The current policy provides an opportunity to say “no, this isn't going to work,” which avoids the difficulties that result from saying “no” at the development review stage.

- In regards to TSPs:
 - The policy creates a conversation about the purpose and need for projects.
- One policy maker noted, the policy has accomplished what it was intended to accomplish, however it's dated and doesn't address the goals for serving other modes, reducing climate impacts, promoting equity, etc.

WHAT'S NOT WORKING

- The targets aren't effective at helping communities get to the vision and goals they are trying to achieve.
- The targets can't be met which has resulted in confusion as to what is able to be done.
- The current policy doesn't allow for the growth of the region, specifically in regards to population and congestion.
- There is public frustration with overall congestion and flaws in the transportation system.
- There is a sense of disconnect between the public and transportation planners and decision-makers.
- The current policy doesn't work for multimodal transportation planning.
 - Ex. Lloyd Center is very multimodal (I-5, streetcar, MAX, bus, bike, ped), but the mobility standards can only look at vehicle capacity and they don't allow for flexibility or consideration of the vehicle trip reduction benefits of compact land use and increased walking, biking, and use of transit. Nor does it allow for the benefits of limiting vehicle capacity in order to promote the other modes.
- The hub and spoke model for transit doesn't serve the region in terms of connecting communities and employment centers, and there is a growing need to build out a grid system for transit.
- The interstate system and throughways should serve longer through trips, not shorter local trips, and needs to remain functional for the commerce that relies on through trips.
- Inefficient and/or poor coordination between the federal, state, and local systems.
- There are not enough resources to accomplish what needs to be done.
- It is thwarting development: SDCs, affordable housing, TODs, and jobs.
- The policy needs to be flexible to allow it to be scaled up to the vision.
- The policy doesn't allow for significant densification around key rapid transit facilities.
- There are serious gaps in mobility for all modes – particularly in regards to transit in Clackamas and Washington counties.
- The current policy is too obtuse for the public to understand easily.
- The standards still point to large, expensive transportation projects when there is very little money to fund those projects.
- The policy doesn't incorporate an equity lens or link to affordable housing, and doesn't allow for increased densities in areas designated for future growth and development.
- Measurements are focused on transportation, but transportation is only a part of how communities work.
- The infrastructure doesn't support population growth and makes it difficult for people to get around quickly and easily without relying on automobiles.
- It takes too long to get exceptions or go through the process to develop and request approval of alternative mobility standards by the Oregon Transportation Commission.
- The policy doesn't address issues related to first/last mile connectivity in regards to accessing transit.
- In regards to TSPs, it's easy to understand and identify the problems, but no one has come up with ways to realistically address the problems in ways that meet the policy when they require unworkable or

unbuildable capacity improvements, or improvements that are counter to the planned land uses, such as walkable neighborhoods.



COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES' PERSPECTIVES ON THE EXISTING SYSTEM

Community/business representatives were asked **“When thinking about mobility, what do you believe is working/not working with the current system?”**

WHAT'S WORKING

A majority of community/business representatives either did not respond to how the system functions well, or explicitly noted that the system is not effective. Of those few that provided ways in which the system is functioning well, the most common response acknowledged that **the system has been effective at connecting people to Portland's downtown urban core by a variety of modes**. Other comments included:

- Efforts to expand transit
- Promoting active transportation
- Vision Zero
- Applying an age-friendly lens to transportation decisions

WHAT'S NOT WORKING

Congestion and lack of transit coverage and service expansion to keep up with growth were the most common issues mentioned by community/business representatives. Other issues included:

- Safety issues
 - Vulnerable communities are at a much higher risk of traffic-related injuries or fatalities
- The “one-size-fits-all” approach to road planning and design resulting in conflicts between modes, safety issues, inefficiency, and poor traffic management
- Inequitable distribution of travel options
- Significant gaps in travel options exist in some parts of the region
- Current hub and spoke model for transit
- Conflicts between modes
- Displacement and gentrification
- Lack of affordability (housing and transportation)
- Inadequate transportation for the mobility-challenged population
- System gaps and lack of connectivity between modes
- A system that doesn't support the goal of reducing drive alone trips, reliance on automobiles, and VMT
- Lack of attention to travel needs other than the traditional home-to-work system user, i.e. travel for needs other than employment, alternative work hours, etc.



PRACTITIONERS' USE OF THE EXISTING POLICY

The transportation land use and transportation practitioners were asked: **“What do you believe is working and not working with the current regional mobility policy, standards and targets?”**

WHAT'S WORKING

While most practitioners agreed that the current policy is inadequate, nearly all agreed that a primary value of the current policy is that it is known, understood and accepted by those who must rely on it.

“There is a threshold. You know how to measure it. You know how to mitigate. No one questions its validity. Developers don't argue. Engineers get it.”

Additional points included:

- It identifies where the congestion problems are in a TSP and therefore helps when prioritizing projects for a 20-year timeframe.
- It is effective and legally defensible for exactions.
- The public is concerned about congestion and wants auto mobility; the policy identifies congestion and auto mobility deficiencies. *Note: This issue was acknowledged by jurisdictions responsible for planning for developing outer parts of the region, as well as for those established in urban centers in the region.*
- Several traffic engineers stressed that v/c is still one of the best tools for understanding the safety and capacity of intersections.
- The staff of one jurisdiction stated that the policy has been working for implementing their concept plans.
- The policy makes it easy to collect data and measure.
- Freight is essential to our economy and it relies on vehicle mobility.
- If a plan amendment fails, ultimately the local jurisdiction can move forward regardless.
- It provides a link to identify consistency with the Transportation Planning Rule.

WHAT'S NOT WORKING

Nearly all practitioners agreed that the policy is either insufficient or just unworkable.

- “It's dated.” “It's all about moving cars.” It does not allow for movement of people and goods through other modes.
- “It's antiquated.” It doesn't reflect the region's goals for climate change, VMT reduction, health, equity, etc. and actually works against those goals. It is in conflict with our city's goals and policies.
- “It's broken. It no longer works to create continuity from long-range planning to projects.” (TSP, to plan amendment, to development review, to projects).
- The transportation system doesn't work. Freeways aren't working. Arterials aren't working.

- Freight chooses to move outside of peak travel times when possible, but increasingly throughout the day there is not enough capacity to support them during off-peak travel times.
- The measures work but the policy doesn't help us achieve the goals we want to achieve.
- The OTC alternative mobility process is too onerous, and potential solutions are unclear.
- No land use balance – can't implement concept plans.
- The results of Metro's peak spreading model can be misinterpreted in how it addresses the measure.
- Does not do a good job of addressing connectivity and system gaps.
- The policy only takes into account peak hour travel, not how a street works during off-peak hours.
- Doesn't get you the nuances that travelers experience, such as delay and travel time.
- V/c doesn't make sense to the public.
- If you use the peak spreading model it doesn't work with the standards.
- The standards are often impossibly high, specifically with the 30th highest hour measure.
- Doesn't address how to create a quality community.
- The land use solutions, just as other modes, are not seen as mitigating factors in meeting the mobility policy. Feels like the developer is being punished for making choices that reduce drive alone trips and reliance on automobiles.
- The policy requires capacity improvements, i.e. left turn lanes that impede MAX travel and therefore make the train less attractive to users.
- For jurisdictions that have a hierarchy of transportation (e.g., pedestrian, bike, transit, etc.), drive along trips are the lowest priority, yet the policy prioritizes vehicle trips to be the highest priority, (e.g., Portland).

3.4 THINKING ABOUT POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE MEASURES OF MOBILITY

All interviewees were asked to review the potential new measures of mobility to be explored in the update to the Regional Mobility Policy and identify the measures they felt would best serve the region's needs. The potential measures include:

- Movement capacity for people and goods throughput, all modes (driving, riding a bus or train, biking, walking or moving goods)
- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
- Travel time and reliability for motor vehicles, including freight and transit
- Transit service coverage and frequency
- Bike and pedestrian network completion
- Mode share
- Network connectivity
- Access to destinations by a variety of modes

Interviewees were also given the opportunity to suggest additional measures for exploration, as well as comment on whether the volume/capacity measure (v/c ratio) should continue to be used as a part of the updated Regional Mobility Policy.



POLICY MAKERS' RECOMMENDED MEASURES

For the policy makers, the following measures received the strongest support.

Transit service coverage

- Need to be making transit-friendly planning decisions, specifically in regards to future growth, development, population, and need
- Remove barriers to using transit

Access to destinations by a variety of modes

- Choice of mode needs to be a main aspect of this measure
- Need to consider flexibility in regards to access to transportation and destinations
- Can be difficult to measure
- Need to consider equity
- Support complete communities (20-minute neighborhoods)
- Can have different needs depending on the functional class and usage along a corridor

Travel time and reliability

- This is something the public can understand and has meaning

Policy makers provided comments or support on the following measures:

- People and goods movement capacity and throughput
 - Throughput is a key aspect of this measure
 - Needs to explicitly call out other modes
- Volume/capacity
 - Considers congestion and vehicle movement which can benefit the economy
 - Should be used as a diagnostic tool, not as the base for decision-making
- VMT
 - Use California as a guide
- Bike and pedestrian network completion
 - Addresses gaps in the system
- Network connectivity
 - It's critical to have a defined network that is agreed upon prior to using network connectivity as a measure
- Mode share
 - Most suggested that measures for alternative modes would be more effective, and that this was better understood as an outcome, not a measure.
 - A few explicitly opposed this as a potential measure due to concerns that the trips were not fungible between modes, or that it would not be easily understood.

Some general comments included:

- This shouldn't be about how it works for the Portland area, but rather how we serve statewide needs in the context of the system in the Portland area.
- Measure trend lines for future planning.
- Develop a measure for technology and innovation, i.e. AV, EV, rideshare, ridehailing, etc.
- Limit the number of measures (3-4) in order to accomplish goals.
- Measures need to support multimodal transportation.
- Safety is an outcome – find measures that ensures that outcome.



BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES' RECOMMENDED MEASURES

Business and community representatives provided feedback on all of the suggested measures, summarized below.

Access to destinations by a variety of modes (*this measure received the strongest support from the community/business representatives*)

- Enables comparisons between and promotes mobility for all modes
- Should be the standard for measuring success
- Can help address needs resulting from growth
- Can help address needs based on social and demographic identity – needs specific to age, location, income, race, gender, etc.
- Promotes development and transportation investments that are place-based (proximity to destinations)
- Addresses congestion
- Engage the community to better understand what destinations are most important – use community input to develop a destination value hierarchy
- Connect to commercial corridors
- Safety needs to be explicit
- Needs to address system gaps
- Needs to include freight

Travel time and reliability

- Important for the freight industry
- Supports the workforce
- Include other modes of transportation, specifically active transportation modes (pedestrian, bikes, etc.)
- Needs to consider environmental justice
- Focus on efficiency, not just trying to force people out of cars by making driving inefficient
- Ensure the assessment is based on reality, i.e. peak hour travel for various modes
- Create a mode hierarchy
- Should serve as the overarching measure

People and goods movement capacity and throughput for all modes

- This should serve as the baseline or “umbrella” for transportation decisions
- Ensure transit is included
- Does not take into account the factors that impact use of all modes of transportation
- Link to the access to destinations measure
- Should be guided by the travel time and reliability measure

Vehicle miles traveled

- Proven and has had success in California
- Can be used to track congestion
- Meets the needs of the community
- Aligns with the goals of addressing climate change, creating livability, and measuring the impacts of development
 - One interviewee felt that climate goals need to be explicit in the measure

Bike and pedestrian network completion

- Can address safety in regards to mode conflicts and access
- Can address gaps in the system (sidewalks, bike paths/lanes, etc.)
- Investments shouldn't be at the expense of freight and vehicle travel
- Has the potential to promote future displacement and issues related to equity
- Needs to be holistic in terms of addressing system gaps

Transit service coverage

- Supports transit dependent people
- Reduces drive alone trips
- Addresses issues related to first/last mile connections to transit
- Should take into account paratransit and deviated routes

Mode share

- Make decisions that incentivize people to use modes other than SOVs
- Needs to be more explicit about climate change

Network connectivity

- Connect to commercial corridors
- Don't use a “one size fits all” approach to connectivity
- Make connectivity for all modes explicit in the measure
- Could be built into the access to destinations measure
- Seems too abstract

Volume/capacity

- Can serve as a good measuring tool
- Too simplistic to serve as the only measure

- Needs to be rational when determining capacity
- Useful for identifying congestion hotspots
- Is legally defensible

Some general comments included:

- Accessibility needs to account for the housing and transportation cost burden - specifically in regards to displacement.
- Safety is important to consider in relation to congestion and conflicts between modes.
- Equity needs to be explicit in all measures included in the policy.
- Measures need to account for transportation innovation, i.e. AV, EV, rideshare, etc.
- Measure changing behavior, i.e. telecommuting, alternative work hours, etc.
- Climate needs to be explicit.
- Measure impacts to natural and regional resources.
- Measure the effectiveness of coordinating land use and transportation planning.



PRACTITIONERS' RECOMMENDED MEASURES

Most practitioners acknowledged all the listed measures were valuable considerations, but almost all practitioners also stressed that, to be effective, the policy would need a clear and narrow set of measures.

The following measures were most commonly suggested:

Bicycle and pedestrian network completion and transit coverage and frequency

- Interviewees frequently discussed these two measures in combination.
- A broader *system* completion (bike, pedestrian, transit, etc.) was discussed as a measure:
 - The City of Portland has developed and tested a tool, tying it to SDCs.
 - California has done market-based work – a developer can be required to pay into a system completeness fund.
- There would need to be clear criteria to define system completion and the targets to completion.
- Topography and/or density need to be considered when defining appropriate levels.
- Need to stop thinking of bike and pedestrian investments as the mitigation.
- Participants discussed a variety of ways to measure transit service, including proximity to jobs and housing, trip time, and seats per hour.
- Clackamas County developed but did not adopt a more holistic mobility policy. They identified multiple measures for bike and pedestrian connectivity, including a bicycle level of stress and measure.

A vehicle measure: Travel time reliability for vehicles, including freight and transit AND/OR Volume to Capacity – v/c

- Most interviewees suggested that a measure for vehicles still needs to be included in the updated mobility policy.

- Most who preferred travel time and reliability suggested it was more intuitive for communication with non-practitioners and more meaningful.
- It was suggested that travel time and reliability may be more useful than v/c for systems that can't be fixed to meet v/c targets
- Reliability is critical for the movement of freight.
- Transit reliability could be measured separately.
- Many – particularly the practitioners with the technical expertise and responsibility to assess the v/c – felt that v/c is still one of the best tools.
 - Provides the most legally defensible data
 - Particularly useful for measuring capacity and safety of intersections
 - Supporters of v/c believed it was easier for people to understand
- Some believed both measures should be used, practitioners within several agencies debated among themselves about which of these measures were most useful.
- A return to Level of Service – LOS – was suggested only once, noting it is still used by some of the jurisdictions for at least some of their facilities. However, several interviewees cautioned that returning to LOS would be a regression.
- A few supported establishing a vehicle cap, such as the cap established by the City of Portland.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

This measure received the most polarized feedback.

Support:

- Some saw great potential for using VMT as an overarching measure to achieve many of the other measures as well as regional goals (mode shift, equity, etc.).
- There was a suggestion that a tool could be built from a VMT system metric in combination with a system completeness measure.
- A couple practitioners saw benefit in having consistency between western states and building on California's work.
- Some noted that VMT supports the Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Concern:

- Some felt VMT was not practical or defensibly measurable, especially for development review and project design.
- Some practitioners pointed to Oregon's different state regulatory framework. California has CEQA (the California Environmental Quality Act) that drives decision making. Oregon has the Statewide Planning Goals and related land use laws, including Goal 12 and the TPR.
- One jurisdiction expressed concern that as a community at the edge of the region with an imbalance of jobs to housing, most residents would commute out of their jurisdiction to work in another community making it difficult for them to compete.

The practitioners provided some feedback on the other measures, as described below:

- Movement of people and goods, all modes – This received broad support, but most felt it was more of a goal or the fundamental purpose of the mobility policy, rather than a measure.
- Network connectivity was recommended by several practitioners as a measure that could be applied on a large and small scale (e.g., TSP and plan amendment scales).
- Access to destinations was a consistent priority or used as a key part of the definition of mobility, but a number of practitioners stated that other measures could be effective at achieving accessibility.
- Mode share was generally not supported and was suggested as an outcome rather than a measure.

Some general comments included:

- There will be great benefit to a regionally adopted set of measures. They will be legally challenged and therefore need broad support and application.
- Many of these are all high-level planning goals; they won't work as measures when developing a plan or looking at a proposed development.
- Using the terms "target" and "measure" instead of "standard" is a good step.
- The measures ultimately need to work for development review, as well. They need to help establish a defensible nexus between the development and any required improvements or investments.
- The measures need to be able to identify incremental change. Using a bunch of measures won't work.
- Consider the possibility of different measures for the plan and for development review.
- We do not yet have good predictive tools for other modes.
- Which should come first – adopting a policy that creates a demand for better tools to generate the needed data, or adopting a policy that is dependent on data from tools that are currently available?

3.5 CONSISTENCY/FLEXIBILITY OF POLICY, MEASURES, AND TARGETS



POLICY MAKERS ON POLICY CONSISTENCY/FLEXIBILITY

Policy makers were asked: **“Do you feel the policy, associated measures, and targets should be applied differently depending on the areas?”**

- A majority of policy makers felt there should be a common set of measures with potentially different targets – specificity depending on the area.
- The application of the policy/measures/targets needs to take into account density.
- The application should recognize the needs in employment centers.
- Any variation in the application of the policy/measures/targets should not promote urban sprawl.
- “It’s like the blind man and the elephant, the region looks very different across the region, for Portland and Metro staff they’re great and very smart, but they don’t understand. They’re looking at the world as a blind man, from the perspective of the urban center. If you look in the outer suburbs you don’t have a grid system, you don’t have transit. They need to be measured differently.”
- Some policy makers felt any necessary variations could be captured through functional class.
- It was noted that it would depend on what the measures are, but that the policy needs to allow for differences in the areas.

- It's important to consider topography, geography, and development, as well as look at gaps – ex. kids in landlocked areas only have the option of using SOVs to leave their area and we need to provide alternative modes in suburbs.
- One policy maker felt the policy/measures/targets should not be applied differently depending on the area, unless there are benefits, noting that there's been an unequal way of measuring across the region.

Policy makers were asked: **“Do you feel the policy, associated measures, and targets should be applied differently depending on the type of road and road use?”**

- It was suggested that the application of the policy/measures/targets should address the purpose of the roadway.
- Many felt that having modes existing side by side doesn't work on all roadways and can create safety issues.
- One policy maker felt it could be problematic because the functional class can look different depending on the community, and that it will change over time, i.e. 82nd Ave.
- One policy maker noted that there is not enough money to make every road function for all modes safely.



COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES ON POLICY CONSISTENCY/FLEXIBILITY

Community/business representatives were asked: **“Do you feel the policy, associated measures, and targets should be applied differently depending on the areas?”**

- A strong majority (80%) of the community/business representatives felt that application of the policy/measures/targets should differ depending on the area.
- Many felt that the policy should remain the same throughout the region, but that the targets should be applied differently based on the reality of the area (i.e. existing infrastructure, population, density, need, etc.)
- Many suggested the concept of a “sliding scale” for applying targets in order to motivate different areas to meet regional mobility goals, while being conscientious of what is achievable at a given point in time within that area.
- The different stages of development across the region and differences in the availability of travel options we a common reason for supporting varied applications of the policy/measures/targets.
- **Other comments included:**
 - Apply the policy in a local, neighborhood, and/or community specific way
 - Assess the activity in the area and apply the policy accordingly
 - Ensure the policy is formed in a way that reflects the regional values

Community/business representatives were asked: **“Do you feel the policy, associated measures, and targets should be applied differently depending on the type of road and/or road use?”**

- All of the community/business representatives that gave a direct response to this question expressed mild to strong support for applying the policy/measures/targets differently based on the type of road and/or road use. Interviewees commonly suggested performing analyses of the road to identify the primary mode usage in order to determine how best to apply the policy/measures/targets.

- Many felt that applying a “one-size-fits-all” approach to roadways has a negative impact on the mobility of all modes.
- Many felt that allowing the policy/measures/targets to be applied differently based on the type of road would help alleviate issues in the system resulting from conflicts between modes.
- **Other comments included:**
 - Allowing for variations in how the policy/measures/targets are applied will help freight mobility
 - Create a “toolkit” for each road type and use it to help when applying the policy/measures/targets
 - The built form of a road should be the driving force in making transportation investments
 - Ruling out the addition of lanes or capacity has a negative impact on freight



PRACTITIONERS ON POLICY CONSISTENCY/FLEXIBILITY

When asked whether there should be differences in the policy, measures or targets, it was a quick and easy, “Yes!” for many of the practitioners.

Others required more thought. While nearly all eventually decided there should be an allowance for differences either based on area or road type, they were deeply concerned about “future proofing” areas that will likely become more dense in time, ensuring our region’s goals are achieved, and protecting the region from sprawl.

Only one jurisdiction’s staff did not support flexibility. They noted that ultimately our outer suburban areas want the same access and mobility options, so it makes sense to include these targets even at the beginning to ensure the system can accommodate them.

Regarding differences based on area:

- Most replied that they supported allowing *different* targets with the *same* policy and measures. Suggested considerations for varied application of targets were:
 - Need to acknowledge that different areas have different barriers to mobility.
 - Density and/or topography. What are the existing and future limitations and opportunities for meeting the targets?
 - Connectivity and availability of other modes. For instance, if TriMet is not investing in the outer areas, we can’t hold them to the same transit targets, but it should still be a measure, and we can create facilities that provide for safe, accessible bus stops or park and rides.
 - Land uses (industrial vs residential), affordable housing. What are the access needs? Aspiration should be to ultimately make complete communities throughout the metro area.
 - May not even need vehicle standards for areas that have achieved a specified level of development with a specified level of available travel options. Some roads should or can be only so wide.

Regarding differences based on functional class or type of roadway:

- Several practitioners supported allowing different targets and, potentially, measures, with the same vision/policy. The primary rationale was for the difference to be based on the designated users or purpose of the road. For instance:

- The role of interstates and throughways is to support statewide and interstate travel through the Portland area and cross-regional travel; not local trips.
- For the sake of freight mobility, designated freight routes need different and/or higher standards for vehicle travel time reliability.
- Designated bike routes need measures and targets that ensure the function and safety for cyclists.
- As a caution, one interviewee stressed that drivers all have apps on their phones that don't care if it's an arterial, collector, or throughway. From a user perspective it won't matter what type of road it is.

3.6 ACCESSIBILITY, SAFETY, EQUITY, AND OTHER MODES



POLICY MAKERS' PERSPECTIVES ON ACCESSIBILITY, SAFETY, EQUITY, AND OTHER MODES

Policy makers were asked **“How would you determine if we have a transportation system that promotes accessibility?”** (Note: Interviewees were informed that the definition of accessibility, in this sense, is not limited to ADA considerations.)

- Addressing first/last mile connectivity, specifically as it relates to transit
- 20-minute neighborhoods
- Transit based on connectivity and/or a transit grid system

Policy makers were asked to address equity and issues related to equity as it relates to mobility:

- “Feels like we’re playing whack-a-mole”
 - Look at underserved communities from a modality perspective, speaking to basic gaps. How much bike/pedestrian infrastructure, transit is within reach.
- Past policies have thwarted affordable housing and have isolated underserved communities
- “We need to do a better job, to agree we’re not going to get it right the first time, and give ourselves the grace to learn and improve. I’m not sure we know what equity is, and we can’t define it based on what we think it is. We need to go to the underserved communities to get their definition of equity.”
- Ex. Happy Valley has a huge Asian-American community and they choose it because of the ability to have a home with enough room for multigenerational families, but they still need access to transit.
- Include people of color and different income groups to help define equitable transportation.
- We don’t have the same resources as other “head-office” cities (Seattle, San Jose, San Francisco), we can’t do it all at once. However, we can’t wait for “perfect,” we have to make imperfect decisions in order to get the “boat to rise for all.”
- Understanding equity areas and ensuring they have access to what they need by a variety of modes
- Need to build a system that serves all people, first/last mile connections to transit are part of that
- A functioning system and region relies on people of all communities being able to get where they need to go – the ripple effect



COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES' PERSPECTIVES ON ACCESSIBILITY, SAFETY, EQUITY, AND OTHER MODES

Community/business representatives were asked **“How would you determine if we have a transportation system that promotes accessibility?”** (Note: Interviewees were informed that the definition of accessibility, in this sense, is not limited to ADA considerations.)

- Many community/business representatives felt that to promote accessibility you need a system that is affordable, efficient, easy, and safe for all users on all modes – *“cheap, fast, safe, and easy.”*
- Other comments included:
 - Address the “first mile, last mile” barrier to using modes other than SOVs – provide multimodal options within a reasonable distance of all users
 - Build complete multimodal systems that seamlessly connect to each other
 - Create a hierarchy of destinations based on need in order to measure accessibility

Community/business representatives were asked **“How would you determine if we have a transportation system that is equitable?”**

- Many suggested developing a policy that helps protect communities from gentrification and displacement.
- A common theme among community/business representative comments was that the transportation system needs to be serving those with the most need. Specifically:
 - Addressing the geographic disparities in the transportation system that have disproportionate impacts on displaced, gentrified, and/or vulnerable communities, specifically in regards to transit coverage.
 - Addressing the housing and transportation cost and travel time burdens
- Multiple community/business representatives suggested performing robust community engagement in current and historically underserved communities to identify and address equity issues. It was noted that commonly multimodal/active transportation investments in communities of color can be seen as an indicator of impending gentrification.
- Other comments included:
 - Increase access to modes
 - Link affordable housing, employment, and development when making transportation investments
 - Make equity the primary lens
 - Include aging and disabled populations in equity discussions and seek universal design when possible
 - *“Age is an equalizer. The system serves you less as you age, regardless of race, gender, income, or location.”*
 - Geography plays a key part in equity. The transportation system is consistently lacking in areas with vulnerable communities.

Age is an equalizer. The system serves you less as you age, regardless of race, gender, income, or location.

Community/business representatives were asked **“How would you determine if we have a transportation system that is safe?”**

- Many noted that conflicts between modes lead to safety issues.
- Many felt that safety was missing from the potential measures.
- A common comment noted the importance of considering the perception of safety for individual users. Examples included:
 - How users feel with the presence of transit police based on experience and identity
 - User confidence and comfort when navigating the transportation system during different times of day and on different modes, i.e. women, aging adults, disabled individuals, people of color, etc.
- The Vision Zero goal was mentioned multiple times both in regards to suggestions for using it as a measure for safety (injuries and fatalities related to traffic incidents), and because some felt the measure was too simplistic and did not adequately demonstrate the safety of the network.
- Other comments included:
 - Safety is addressed in other policies and regulations in the region and does not need to be built into the update
 - Engage the community in order to determine the best way to address safety issues

Community/business representatives were asked “**How would you determine if we have a transportation system that supports other modes?**”

- Key themes from community/business representatives answers to this question included:
 - Considerations for ADA and paratransit, including exploring place-based options for transit coverage, i.e. deviated routes, shuttles for transit dependent users to meet basic needs (groceries, social interaction, etc.)
 - Providing for users that use multiple modes within a single commute, i.e. providing adequate parking and bike storage at MAX stations
 - Providing multimodal options in communities with the most need



PRACTITIONERS' PERSPECTIVES ON EQUITY

Practitioners generally covered the issues of accessibility and safety when discussing measures and the current system. When asked “**How do we determine whether we have an equitable transportation system?**” the key messages were as follows:

- There was universal support for striving for a more equitable transportation system, one that provides for all modes, ensuring transportation options at a basic level.
- There was also a lack of confidence that the field of practitioners have the right qualifications to define an equitable transportation system. They encouraged the project team to seek input from communities of color, low-income, disabled and other underserved communities.
- Displacement was a major concern with two primary perspectives:
 - We need to target investments to underserved communities and identify actions to avoid and mitigate displacement
 - Transportation investments will create displacement, so the best approach is to work toward a complete system throughout the Portland area.

- A number of practitioners noted that some of the biggest historical displacement has been due to major infrastructure projects (I-5), so the mobility policy should include protection of neighborhoods.
- A few expressed concerns that there are racist policies on which some engineering practices are based, creating substantial impacts to black and lower income communities, and a hypothesis that v/c and LOS have contributed to those impacts.
- Areas with a higher concentration of underserved populations will have a higher percentage of transportation disadvantaged – transit dependent and mobility challenged – so should receive priority for investments in alternative modes.
- Community colleges are a good resource for tracking where the populations are moving.
- On the other hand, a number of practitioners discussed challenges to investing in serving underserved populations:
 - Some areas have significant diversity, but it is dispersed, not concentrated. Nonetheless, they need the mode options.
 - The industrial areas employees are often from underserved populations. Transit doesn't serve these communities. They must rely on cars.
 - Investing in transportation for industry creates family-wage jobs for non-college educated.

3.7 MANAGING FOR PROJECT SUCCESS

All interviewees were asked what outcomes *would* and *would not* want to see as a result of this update to the policy.



POLICY MAKERS

Good Outcomes:

- This effort needs to provide a roadmap for the policy from the TSP to plan amendments to development review to capital projects
- Relevant today and tomorrow – planning for future – way people live and want to live
- Reduce trips people have to take and don't want to take - choices
- Support the economy
- Flexibility with clarity, that allows context but is easily understood and can be applied
- Leads to implementation with an eye for plan amendments and projects
- Something that is fully embraced by the Council and OTC
- Process in place for making decisions that we all agree on
- Identify the underserved areas and gaps and use that to provide better service and options for all
- Transportation improvements done through an equity lens
- Understandable to real people, not just transportation professionals
- A policy that doesn't just look at v/c, but looks at the goals of safety, equity, and capacity in order to give a better measurement of our strengths for all modes
- Something more flexible to meet goals

Concerns/Bad Outcomes:

- Something that works for the Portland area and the communities within but not for the State as a whole
 - “We can’t put walls around what happens in the metro area, we still need a functional state system through the metro area. Can’t be parochial.”
- Something that puts us at a disadvantage to winning dollars and meeting goals – it’s a planning tool, the current policy falls short
- Something that contributes to sprawl



COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES

Good Outcomes:

- A more equitable and culturally nuanced approach to measuring mobility
- Using a “less stick, more carrot” approach to reducing SOV use
- Taking a broader, more regional approach to the policy
 - Not applying a “one size fits all” approach across the region, understanding the different needs
- Using more than one measure for mobility
- Policy that measures both for mobility as well as accessibility (they are not the same, but go hand in hand)
- Reduction of congestion and traffic
- Identifying the shared goals of reducing conflicts between the modes
- A policy that is framed to address externalities, i.e. climate, public health, safety, displacement, etc.

Concerns/Bad Outcomes:

- A continuation of the same policy and measures, or keeping the status quo
- Taking an approach that tries to force people out of cars, rather than providing better options
- A rigid, “one size fits all” approach to areas and roads with different needs
- A measure that focuses too heavily on vehicle mobility
- Freeway expansion
- Prohibiting increased capacity



PRACTITIONERS

Good Outcomes:

- It will define and measure moving people and goods, not just vehicles.
- It will support our broader community goals.
- It will be measurable and clear, easy to understand and apply, and therefore is implemented.
- It will support, not de-incentivize, the 2040 plan, allowing for increased development in centers and corridors.
- It will advance equity, safety and address climate change.
- It supports freight reliability.

- A clear policy with targets and measures for the TSP and plan amendments, but also a roadmap on how to carry it through development review and capital projects.

Concerns/Bad Outcomes:

- It will just be a tweak of the existing system, because it's known and comfortable.
- It reduces freight mobility.
- We don't want a thick manual on how to apply the policy.

We don't want a thick manual on how to apply the policy.

3.8 PROJECT PROCESS AND FUTURE ENGAGEMENT

INTEREST IN FUTURE ENGAGEMENT

Interviewees were asked if they were **interested in participating in further engagement opportunities related to this effort to update the Regional Mobility Policy**. All interviewees expressed interest in further participation, with a few community and business representatives indicating tentative apprehension to further participation based on availability and level commitment, and/or suggesting that the perspective they were chosen to represent could be better represented through an alternative individual.

INDIVIDUALS AND/OR ORGANIZATIONS TO INCLUDE IN FUTURE ENGAGEMENT

Interviewees were asked to suggest additional individuals and/or organizations to include in future engagement. A full list of their responses is included in **Appendix B**.

MESSAGING AND PROJECT COMMUNICATION

Policy makers, practitioners, and business/community representatives were asked for their thoughts on how to adapt the messaging and communication for the project and Regional Mobility Policy.



POLICY MAKERS

Many policy makers felt there was need for a broader range of voices involved in the process. Additionally, some policy makers felt that the project would benefit from improving the messaging to explain what the policy is and why the update is happening in a way that is tailored to those without technical experience.



COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES

Many business and community representatives had suggestions for future messaging around the project. Of those that provided feedback on this topic, a significant number felt the factsheet language was too focused on the

technical details of the policy and felt it distracted from how the policy actually relates to the average person, regardless of background, community, or industry. Other comments included:

- Personalize and tell a story in the messaging, and tailor it to the audience
- Explain the purpose and goals of this project as it relates to the region, communities, and industries in a way that is high level and tangible – summarize
- Explaining in terms of the year 2040 can be hard to comprehend – express the urgency and actionable nature of the project and policy
- Make the values explicit
- Use examples of how it impacts transportation and land use decisions
- Express the urgency and relevancy of this update for the region
- Coordinate and engage affordable housing representatives, the major shipping industry, business associations, and chambers of commerce



PRACTITIONERS

While many transportation and land use practitioners focused mainly on how best to improve the mobility policy, a number had suggestions for future communication and engagement practices during the update process. One of the major suggestions came from **both small and large jurisdictions and requested the opportunity for jurisdictions to learn about each other's needs to better understand what would make the mobility policy work across the region.** Other comments included:

- Engage more people within the agencies that perform the technical work in applying the standards
- Reach out to and engage members of underserved and historically marginalized communities to better define an equitable transportation system
- Use and learn from similar efforts in other parts of the country, specifically in California
- Look to existing and relevant case studies, as well as perform case studies in order to test the different concepts being considered and build confidence that the resulting policy will be defensible and practical
- Look to Clackamas County's work developing an alternative mobility policy

SUGGESTED INFORMATIONAL TOOLS

Interviewees were asked to supply any additional documents or tools that could help inform this effort. Documents are included in **Appendix C.**

4.0 Key Challenges to Address in the Update Process

As discussed in previous sections, there is unquestionable support for developing a policy that takes into account a broader definition of mobility than just motor vehicle capacity and v/c. There is also broad commitment to the

region's hallmark land use, climate and social equity goals and values. However, as is also evident in the previous sections, there are a number of challenges to address in order to develop a policy that balances these objectives and that is broadly accepted and used. Key among those challenges are the following:

- Stakeholders urge Metro and ODOT to adopt a mobility policy that will be **practical – simple, applicable and legally defensible**.
 - Stakeholders stressed that the policy needs to remain simple enough to ensure it will actually be broadly adopted and applied. Most interviewees supported a narrow set of measures that would account for transit and active transportation, as well as motor vehicles. However, the set of their suggested measures varied significantly from stakeholder to stakeholder, especially for vehicle capacity.
 - In addition to being simple, stakeholders stressed that the new policy needs to be legally defensible at each stage of its application – TSP, plan amendment, development review, and design of capital projects.
 - Stakeholders, especially practitioners and policy makers, will want tangible evidence that the policy works and can be applied by agencies with diverse needs, and with a range of resources and abilities. *To accomplish the practicality and legal defensibility, stakeholders would like measures that are tested and proven – such as through case studies that illustrate how the policy works in different areas of the Portland region – and that rely on data that is readily available now or will be before the policy is implemented.*
- The process for updating the mobility policy needs to explore how to provide **flexibility based on area and/or road type**, while maintaining and supporting the region's goals and values for a well-connected, integrated, multimodal system. While nearly all stakeholders recognized a need for flexibility, very few expressed confidence about how best to do so. Most stakeholders will approach this challenge with an open mind, but will want evidence that any variations are justified. For areas and roads that are in earlier stages of development, most stakeholders will want the update process to *explore the concept of allowing flexible targets while also ensuring the application of lower targets does not remain stagnant, and that if lower targets are applied it does not imply that an area or road will not have to meet higher targets in the future in order to maintain the goals and values of the region.*
- Many of the **community and business stakeholders found the purpose and nature of the policy confusing**. While the information in the factsheet helped to some degree, it was only after providing more tangible examples of how the policy is used and how it affects them that they were able to have a meaningful discussion about the policy. Additionally, many community and business stakeholders came to the interview with the impression that they would need to have technical knowledge in order to meaningfully participate. In future communications during the mobility policy update process, information about the policy and process needs to be developed in a way that is easily understood by those being engaged, and highlights the value-based nature of discussion. *Tailor communications to the stakeholders using real world examples of how the mobility policy is used and how it affects them, their industry, their interests, and/or the community they represent.*
- Stakeholders were very supportive of updating the mobility policy in a way that **promotes an equitable transportation system**, however, there were varying opinions on how to define equity as it relates to transportation, as well as how to make transportation investments in order to achieve an equitable transportation system. Despite the differing viewpoints, stakeholders across the board suggested that the

mobility policy should be updated using an equity lens. They stressed that Metro and ODOT should first *reach out to underserved and historically marginalized communities to more clearly understand how they would define an equitable transportation system and to understand how the policy could best help achieve that.* Many suggested not only reaching out to the representatives of advocacy organizations, but also to members of those communities that daily rely on and struggle with all aspects of the existing system.

Appendix A: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

| Policy Makers | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Name | Affiliation |
| Council President Lynn Peterson | Metro Council |
| Chair Bob Van Brocklin | Oregon Transportation Commission |
| Vice-Chair Robin McArthur | Land Conservation and Development Commission |
| Commissioner Jessica Vega Peterson | Multnomah County |
| Commissioner Paul Savas | Clackamas County |
| Commissioner Roy Rogers | Washington County |
| Doug Kelsey | TriMet |
| Jerri Bohard | ODOT |
| Margi Bradway | Metro |

| Transportation and Land Use Practitioners | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| Name | Affiliation |
| Bill Holstrom | DLCD |
| Matt Crall | |
| Jennifer Donnelly | |
| Chris Deffebach | Washington County |
| Tom Harry | |
| Jinde Zhu | |
| Stacy Shetler | |
| Karen Buehrig | Clackamas County |
| Joe Marek | |
| Richard Nys | |
| Joanna Valencia | Multnomah County |
| Jessica Berry | |
| Eric Hesse | City of Portland |
| Eric Engstrom | |
| Peter Hurley | |
| Bob Kellett | |
| Laura Terway | Oregon City |
| Dayna Webb | |
| Phil Healy | Portland of Portland |
| Tom Bouillion | |
| Avi Tayar | ODOT Region 1 |
| Chi Mai | |
| Rachael Tupica | Federal Highway Administration |
| Nathaniel Price | |
| Nick Fortey | |
| Linda Swann | |
| Carl Springer | DKS Associates |
| Matt Hughart | Kittelson and Associates |
| Frank Angelo | Angelo Planning |
| Darci Rudzinski | |

| Transportation and Land Use Practitioners | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Kirsten Pennington | WSP |
| Christe White | Radler White Parks & Alexander. LLP |

| Community and Business Representatives | |
|--|--|
| Name | Affiliation |
| Commissioner Pam Treece | Westside Economic Alliance |
| Corky Collier | Columbia Corridor Association |
| Jarvez Hall | East Metro Economic Alliance |
| Ady Everette | Business for Better Portland |
| Heather A. Hoell | Venture Portland |
| Rob Freeman | Fred Meyer Distribution |
| Lanny Gower | Con-Way Freight, Inc. |
| Jana Jarvis | Oregon Trucking Association |
| Waylon Buchan | |
| Tyler Lawrence | Green Transfer |
| Willy Myers | Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council |
| Jillian Detweiler | Street Trust |
| Mariana Valenzuela | Centro Cultural |
| Hannah Holloway | Urban League of Portland |
| Jeff Pazdalski | Westside Transportation Alliance |
| Glenn Koehrsen | TPAC Community Representative |
| Elaine Freisen-Strang | AARP |
| Bandana Shrestha | |
| Julie Wilke | Ride Connection |
| Bob Sallinger | Audubon Society |
| Ted Labbe | Urban Greenspaces Institute |
| Chris Rall | Transportation for America |
| Kelly Rodgers | Street Smart |

Appendix B: Suggested Engagement

| | |
|---|---|
| AAA Oregon | No More Freeways PDX |
| American Aging Association | Operation Engineers Local 701 |
| APANO | Oregon Environmental Council |
| Central Eastside Industrial Council | Oregon Latino Health Coalition |
| City Observatory | Oregon Trails Coalition |
| Community Cycling Center | Own Consulting |
| Community Vision Inc. | Physicians for Social Responsibility |
| Disability Rights Oregon | Portland African American Leadership Forum |
| Disability Services Advisory Council | Portland Business Association |
| East Metro Economic Alliance | Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives Inc. |
| East Portland Land Use and Transportation Committee | Portland Freight Committee |
| Franz Bakery Distribution | Portland Housing Advisory Commission |
| Friends of Trees | Portland Planning Commission |
| Getting There Together Coalition | Portland Public Schools |
| Habitat for Humanity | Portland Public Schools Parent Teacher Associations |
| Hacienda CDC | Renew Oregon |
| Intel | Ride Connection Board of Directors |
| Jade District | Rose CDC |
| Jarrett Walker and Associates | Self Enhancement Inc. |
| Laborers Local 737 | Sightline Institute |
| Latino Health Coalition | Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee |
| Metro Transportation Funding Task Force | Street Trust |
| Multnomah County Social Services | Verde |
| Nike Shuttle Staff | |

Appendix C: Suggested Informational Tools

[Transportation for American: Guiding Principles \(Updated September 2019\)](#)

[Metro Transportation Funding Taskforce \(various materials\)](#)

Ted Talks: A Day in the Life Series (how people move through the city)

[ODOT Transportation Systems and Operations Management Plan \(2017\)](#)

[Transportation Research Board \(relevant studies and documents\)](#)

Washington County travel time information (unreleased)

[San Francisco Transportation Demand Management Tool](#)

[Clackamas Regional Connections Study Task 4.1.2 Implementation Recommendations Memo](#)

Clackamas County Social Services Needs Assessment Survey 2019

[Clackamas Regional Center Connections Project Task 4.2 Transportation System Safety Performance Measures](#)