

Public testimony to supplement listening sessions on GetMoving 2020 plan

Received June 21 – July 10, 2020 to the getmoving@oregonmetro.gov email.

Collin Miller

Received: June 21, 2020

Addressing climate change in the face of a growing regional population and congestion requires that we reduce the length and distance of trips taken by car. To do so, we must have a transit system, supported by protected bikeways and a complete and safe walking network. Metro's package includes projects that widen roadway capacity for autos, which always leads to increase levels of driving. The package also includes some transit projects and some bike projects and some improvements to sidewalks and pedestrian crossings across the Metro region (Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties).

To truly make a dent in our climate emissions, we must spend the billions of dollars being asked for by this bond measure ONLY on a big bold vision for the region, a vision that will significantly improve non-auto access for all of the region's residents. A resilient transportation network that generates ridership, improves safety, and provides equitable access to all of the social and economic benefits this region has to offer. The transit system should:

- Build integrated regional networks of bus and rail transit, in dedicated lanes, linking neighborhood centers, commercial centers, and job centers.
- Build integrated regional networks of protected bikeways connecting to centers and neighborhoods
- Build safe, connected pedestrians' access to stations, beginning with the most transit-dependent areas of the region.

Essentially, we are asking that Metro stop its progress toward approving the recommendations that have been issued and generate a proposal that it can prove will substantially reduce transportation-related carbon emissions within five years of bond passage.

Dawn Lianna

Received: June 28, 2020

To whom it may concern:

Please consider an electric ferry as a viable option for Oak Grove to Lake Oswego bicyclists and pedestrians. I for one would use that and not the bridge.

A ferry would make our community unique. It adds charm and character which we need. We are diverse group of people and many of us would like our transportation to match our desires to also include the arts, music and better restaurants to our area to attract the right people and finances.

Look at near by towns of Oregon City, Milwaukie and West Linn. We are growing in interesting ways that attracts good people. So would a ferry and it's so much less expensive than a horrible bridge which would ruin homes and community feeling.

Thank you.

Anatta Blackmarr

Received: June 29, 2020

Dear Metro Councilors,

Climate change is the all-encompassing issue of our time. It is crucial that we shift from gasoline-powered cars to active transportation and non-CO2 emitting public transit. In light of this, it's of utmost importance to consider all public transportation possibilities—especially bike/pedestrian electric ferry systems.

A major benefit of a bike/ped ferry service is removing cars from the road. Frog Ferry* estimates that operating four vessels for a year would remove about two million cars from our roads, helping relieve congestion, as well as reducing CO2 pollution.

In addition to an electric ferry system helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions, constructing a ferry system requires very little in the way of an initial carbon footprint. Because the river is the road, there is no massive amount of concrete, asphalt or steel required to set it up. Establishing a ferry system has a far smaller carbon footprint than building roads, rails, or bridges. And a ferry system's responsiveness to ridership needs is made possible by the fact that it can be built quickly, easily adding docks and destinations and increasing the number of vessels whenever needed—unlike other infrastructure projects that are literally cast in concrete.

In Vermont, a few cyclists created an ad hoc bike/ped ferry system to get across the mouth of the Winooski River. Since its inception, it has grown into a well-established and beloved transit option for the active transportation community there. Whether in Vermont, Washington, California, New York, New Orleans, British Columbia, or elsewhere, there are numerous examples of cyclists benefiting from ferry systems—in the U.S. and around the world. Why not have that option here—both for recreation and commuting?

The dollar cost of setting up a ferry system is also far less than for other major infrastructure projects. And with the advent of electric ferryboats, oil-based fuel pollution in the river, and noise are no longer issues. Having a fleet of ferryboats also adds to emergency response capability.

Frog Ferry is well on its way to launching its pilot project, having completed feasibility studies, made agreements with communities for dock locations, and worked with government agencies. The advent of a ferry system would be the start of a new era in the Metro region and bring positive new versatility to transportation here at a time when we need things to celebrate. I urge you not to wait any longer but to welcome bike/ped ferry service into our region. I ask that you provide support for Frog Ferry in the Getting Moving 2020 ballot measure. Thank you very much for considering this.

Sincerely,
Anatta Blackmarr
14207 SE Fair Oaks Ave., Oak Grove, 97267

Kitty Midson

Received: June 29, 2020

My initial reaction is, "what about Covid19?" I'm normally a huge fan of public transportation. I ride because I believe in it, not because I have no other option. Now, however, I won't ride. Admittedly it's hearsay, but not all riders are practicing social distancing or wearing masks. This virus isn't going away soon and may not be the only one in our near future, and pandemics need to be factored in. Yes, bring on more and better mass transit, but make it virus safe.

As for trails and multi use paths, make them safer for pedestrians. "Sharing" with cyclists means being hyper vigilant and staying out of the way of cyclists. Pedestrians need their own safe places.

Michael Hangland-Skill

Received: June 30, 2020

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments on the Get Moving 2020 plan. I hold the point of view from a North Clackamas resident who works across the region, centering mainly in central Portland. I also speak as a lifelong Clackamas resident who knows how this region has changed.

My first comment is on the 82nd corridor, which terminates to the south in Clackamas. I appreciate the emphasis on safety that has been placed on this corridor. Pedestrian safety is key here. In North Clackamas and in Portland's Jade District (SE Division to SE Powell), high density cultural centers are forming. Car travel cannot inhibit the cultural and community growth of those areas. We should not prioritize single-occupancy car rides. Rather, we need to create safe pedestrian and bike pathways and fortify our transit along the corridor. With every decision, we must take into account the effect on our environment and the ramifications of climate change. No new additional asphalt should be laid upon ground where road was not already there. This includes your plan for the 82nd and Airport Way overpass. This overpass is a redundant addition to the corridor and to an already transit connected destination. The MAX red line serves the airport and Cascade Station commercial area well. If you want to reduce traffic, bolster transit service; offer alternatives to cars. The 82nd and Airport Way overpass should be removed from consideration and the funds transferred to transit initiatives.

My next comment is on the 212/Sunrise corridor. I traveled this highway to school everyday from grades 2 through 8 when I attended the historic Carver School along the Clackamas River. While traffic has increased, I do not see the need to add additional lane miles to the corridor. Again, if you want to decrease traffic, you need to offer alternatives to single-occupancy drivers. This means the possibility of rail, bus and bus rapid transit. The 212 corridor is growing rapidly as a residential, commercial, and industrial hub. We should see it as a center of Clackamas' economic and community development. This means we need to have vision. The project should first consider transit alternatives with pedestrian and bike infrastructure. The project should not add additional asphalt to the 212 corridor. As I said before, every decision has to consider the effect on climate change and our environment. Highway 212 should not be expanded and transit alternatives should be explored.

My final comment is on the McLoughlin corridor. I appreciate your emphasis here on transit and safe pedestrian and bike infrastructure. McLoughlin is a fast and often dangerous arterial. We should first prioritize our transit service that already exists on the corridor. Bolster the MAX

service in Milwaukie and consider an extension of the orange line to Oregon City along the corridor. Plenty of busses travel along the corridor, too. We should increase their service and consider a bus rapid transit line service Oregon City, Milwaukie and Portland. I envision McLoughlin as a walkable, safe main street that creates a center of community, cultural and economic growth. Slow down the cars and offer alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles.

Sincerely,
Michael Hangland-Skill
Clackamas Resident

Arlen Sheldrake

Received: July 2, 2020

My project priority suggestions for the measure when it passes:

- 1) move MAX off the Steel Bridge and put MAX in a tunnel under the Willamette River.
- 2) return the Zoo Railway operations to the Rose Garden.
- 3) get MAX to Vancouver WA.
- 4) get MAX from Hillsboro to Forest Grove
- 5) provide support as opportunity arises to support intercity rail: Portland to Vancouver BC

Arlen L. Sheldrake

1718 SW Parkview Court

Portland OR 97221

Terry Parker

Received: July 3, 2020

I will be voting an absolute NO on Metro's extravagant transportation bond measure should it be placed on the November ballot. With the Coronavirus recession likely playing out long term, now is not the time to increase taxes. In addition to an increase in the business payroll tax, Metro is once again choosing to fleece and extort car owners and drivers with an additional \$56 increase vehicle registration fee to pay for alternative mode infrastructure without even a nod to realistically increasing motor vehicle capacity.

Car trips in the Portland-Metro area are expected to increase regardless of how much mass transit service is added. Nearly 15% of the jobs in Oregon are tied to the automobile. Per both Metro and TriMet surveys prior to the Coronavirus pandemic; congestion, road maintenance and the need to increase roadway capacity have been among the top transportation priorities. Portland is 30 years in the rear of having a street and highway system that has the motor vehicle capacity to meet the needs of a post Coronavirus economy. Yet the majority of the money coming from the proposed vehicle increased motor vehicle registration fees will not be used to benefit the payees. Not adding more motor vehicle capacity to keep up with population growth is artificially creating premeditated congestion. The needs of the community are not being met!

Equity is absent! Instead of bribing transit users for votes with reduced fares and free rides, people riding transit need to help pay for transit infrastructure by increasing fares, not reducing them or making transit free. One two-axle bus does as much damage to the streets and roads as 1200 cars. Additionally, adding more transit options will also increase the continual ongoing and increasing taxpayer costs to subsidize operations. Fares also need to cover a greater share of those operational costs that at pre-Coronavirus ridership levels, were approximately 75% taxpayer subsidized. Due to the virus and current lower ridership, the taxpayer subsidized operational costs are even higher.

Likewise, freeloading bicyclists need to start paying their own way for the privileged infrastructure they utilize. Instead of adding \$56 to motor vehicle registrations; equity needs to be established by Metro implementing a mandatory \$60 or more annual bicycle registration fee.

The bottom line here is Metro's extravagant transportation bond measure package is dictatorial social engineering designed to extract and extort money from the wrong people at the wrong time. Without completely dropping the concept of any consideration of tolling the Metro area freeways; and without the elimination of Multnomah County's already board of commissioners only approved discriminatory \$56 vehicle registration fee for the Burnside Bridge where the users of other modes of transport that utilize the bridge are not charged; and where as fixing the Rose Quarter bottleneck on I-5 is not included as part of the bond measure

package; if placed on the November ballot, Metro's extravagant and discriminatory transportation bond measure needs to be shot down by voters.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Parker
Northeast Portland

Jane Gordon

Received: July 3, 2020

I looked through the link in Metro's email about the transportation plan to find the proposed means to pay for it; which no doubt will fall to residents! I can't find specifics.

I read an Oregonian article a while back that mentioned at least partial funding was to be added to vehicle-related fees. If that's correct, I feel VERY strongly that any such fees should be linked to miles driven per year or at a license tag renewal point. NOT a flat fee or or increase of license or registration fees. I am retired and no longer work or have to commute, so few of the proposed changes will have a positive impact on me. Heavy users of roads should pay for that usage, not those of us on fixed incomes and low road users. Property tax increases and bond levies are already a burden when income doesn't increase.

Please factor in the burden on seniors, retired, and others who struggle with ever increasing financial burdens for services far beyond what they need or use. Paying for the future gets more difficult when you can barely pay for the present!

Jane Gordon
Portland, OR 97219

Leeor Schweitzer

Received: July 5, 2020

Thank you for all of your work on this measure.

I don't have specific feedback at this time, but I wanted to write to emphasize that I think this measure should focus on transit, active transportation, and safety improvements, and should not devote money towards building new highways. I see that the only money slated for those goals and for planning and exploring community impacts, and that it is a small portion of the total package, which I appreciate. I hope that if you end up making any changes to the final proposal, that you will continue to prioritize transit, active transportation, and safety and avoid allocating more towards highway building or planning.

Thank you for all of your hard work on this.

Leeor

Erica Skadson

Received: July 6, 2020

- Make all buses and the Max free!
- Make Trimet actually run on time and the transit tracker accurate. I can't tell you how many times it made me late because of late busses and the tracker just being wrong entirely about times or ghost buses.
- Have night buses, or at the very least, ones that run after the bars close.
- Create ways to keep people safer at night on public transportation, but not police.
- Have a lot more bus and shuttle options to and from Vancouver.
- NO toll lanes on I-5, which will destroy neighborhoods adjacent to the freeway, and further subject them to traffic, pollution, and speeding on their streets.
- If tolls are implemented, make an exception for anyone living within 1/4 mile of the freeway who already suffer from pollution and noise from having to live close to it. Make low income exceptions to tolls if implemented.
- Give property tax subsidies to those who have to live near the freeways.
- Put more pedestrian/bike overpasses over I-5.
- Give vouchers and subsidies to low income folks for taxis so they can get home after buses stop running or if they live far from a stop.
- Give subsidies to low income folks to buy electric bikes, bicycles, and electric cars.
- Big penalties for not using turn signals.
- Fix the ridiculous traffic flow patterns out in on North Williams which puts bikes on the left side and in turn lanes and wanders around, causing massive confusion and conflict for bikes and cars alike.
- Make the scooters have helmets required.

- More electric charging stations for cars and bicycles, but metered fees.
- Give out free bike lights and helmets to low income people.
- Make bus drivers wait until you sit down to start driving.
- Make bus drivers wait to coordinate people getting off the Max who want to transfer. I see this constantly at Lombard and Interstate where riders run for the 4 and 75 when the light is red across the busy intersection and across the Max tracks when a train could come from the other direction, all because drivers won't wait a few seconds for passengers to safely make a transfer because everyone know waiting takes forever for the next bus, and it isn't really safe and definitely not pleasant at all to wait at those stops, particularly at night. The bus drivers will see the train arrive, see you coming, and just leave anyway.
- Fix the dangerous overpass over I-5 at Lombard for those biking or walking on the North side of the road, there is no signage or lanes at or before this insane crossing.
- Rows with single seats on buses and Max for safety even when Covid is quelled.
- Have demonstration stations set up so people can learn how to safely and quickly mount their bike to the front of a bus. I've wanted to use this for 25 years but am too intimidated to do it while everyone stares at you. This is best shown in person. This could be set up at the Bikeways events, community events, Pioneer Square at the ticket office, etc.
- Again, MAKE TRIMET FREE!!!

Lee Helfend

Received: July 6, 2020

Good evening,

My name is Lee Helfend (they/them) and I work at OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon. I speak today to stand in solidarity with the Getting There Together coalition. The work that we have been able to accomplish in order to make this measure more equity focused is truly amazing, but we know that the true test will be seen in the outcomes of how this measure is implemented.

I specifically want to highlight the great need for BIPOC and low-income communities to have YouthPass for all. Having grown up in the Portland metro area, I know that the YouthPass program would have made all the difference for me. It means our youth can access resources, recreational activities, and job opportunities. When you grow up without a lot of money, every dollar counts, and every opportunity has the potential to change the course of your life. Fair and equal access to transportation is a human right, and I'm pleased that Metro has included this program in a robust way.

Thank you.

Lee Helfend, they/them

Audrey Groce

Received: July 7, 2020

Metro Councilors,

My name is Audrey Groce, and I'm a resident of Portland. I am writing to share my priorities for the Get Moving transportation funding measure that Metro is considering for the November 2020 ballot. For me, our priorities as a region must be entirely dedicated to sustainability and equity. Racial and climate justice are inextricably linked and must be considered in tandem as we plan to improve transportation in Greater Portland. I am appreciative of the considerable work that has gone into this measure, as well as the voices that have been included in the conversation. I am glad to see that this proposal centers themes of equity and sustainability. I believe we should be focusing exclusively on pedestrian, bike, and transit improvements, and moving away from projects that pour money into highways. I am wary of this size, scope, and price tag of this measure. I understand that politics play a large role here, and measures of this size often contain concessions so that they will be able to pass. However, I encourage you to consider the elements of this measure that can truly push our region into its most accessible, sustainable, and anti-racist iteration yet. Where can we continue to carve out space and funding for the projects that can make the most meaningful change for our most vulnerable residents?

Thank you for your time,
Audrey Groce

Paul Runge

Received: July 7, 2020

Metro Councilors,

My name is Paul Runge. I'm a 28-year-old graduate student at PSU. I work for a local consultancy and a small research organization in Portland.

I support investment in a more equitable and environmentally sustainable region. Get Moving 2020 is an opportunity to make such investments. As a very general request, I ask that you pare down Get Moving 2020 investments to include only those projects that simultaneously advance equity, reduce carbon emissions, and can collectively pass a regionwide vote. We can't afford to take any steps backward with this bond by including projects that do otherwise. Please give secondary consideration to the return on investment from such projects in terms of fees and long term increases in tax productivity. We should have our eye on developing a tax base to support more equitable and sustainable investments in the future.

Thank you,
Paul Runge

Mary Anne Cassin

Received: July 8, 2020

I am writing to voice my full-throated support of referring this ballot measure to the voters this fall. There are many reasons for my support, summarized by bullet point below, but I also want to compliment staff on the extensive, thorough and inclusive public involvement process that was used to develop the list of projects and the shape of them (in particular SW Corridor).

The reasons this measure earned my support:

- The list of projects directly addresses equity, not only geographically but by type of project and by populations served;
- The projects are balanced by approaches - not only capital projects but also important program issues like a switch to electric fleet of buses;
- Addressing climate change through multiple modes of transportation;
- The timeliness of this effort given the economic situation and the need for infrastructure projects;
- The important addition of the Albina Vision project.

Please let me know how I can help the campaign once it is referred.

Gerald Fox

Received: July 8, 2020

Greetings.

I am excited that the region is going to have the opportunity to vote on a major transportation package. I would like to propose three components to be included in this package.

1) Portland and Western is likely to abandon the Cornelius Line. If they do, it will be almost valueless, and Metro should acquire it for a future commute rail line plus bike trail. This would provide a shortcut route into Portland, and alleviate traffic on highway 26.

2) The Zoo railway is a treasured regional amenity that has fallen through the cracks because the Zoo has decided running a train is not one of their core activities. A new structure is needed to take over this line, and reopen it.

3) The Columbia River Crossing will come back. Before the region decides what to do with the I-5 bridges, there needs to be a concerted effort to develop all the alternatives that will reduce traffic demand on I-5. This effort should include not just studies, but actions !

- It is well known that LRT to Vancouver would divert significant trips off the freeway three quarters of the line is built, and three quarters of the service is already being provided. Let's finish it !.

- A commute rail line from Battleground Wa. to Portland would intercept both I-205 and I-5, and give a fast, reliable trip into Portland and beyond.

- A safe, traffic free bike path between Portland and Vancouver would cream off some traffic at low cost, and also be a recreational amenity.

- And the option of a ferry between Portland and Vancouver waterfront would be both attractive and useful. Let's get on with it.

Gerald Fox

Colin Cortes

Received: July 8, 2020

Dear Metro:

Consider these comments on the draft plan found at <www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/get-moving-2020/draft-plan>:

- 82nd Avenue: What's item 5, Airport Way "overcrossing"? I know the T-intersection, and the word overcrossing implies an unnecessary and expensive highway interchange in all but name. It works as is; the MAX crossing doesn't delay that much. Other items better need the money.
- Central City: item 3, Ross Island Bridge Head. I'm against some of the Naito Parkway Main Street because I don't want more intersections and stoplights between the south end of Naito at Barbur and the bridge because of delay. The westbound direct swoop onto Naito southbound is good as is. From Naito northbound to the stop sign to go east onto the bridge is tolerable. This route is one of the few good regional driving routes and one that avoids downtown altogether. It's popular because aside from I-5 Marquam and the transit Tilikum, the nearest bridges are the modest Hawthorne to the north and the Sellwood to the south. Naito Parkway Main Street can do whatever it wants north of the interchange of Naito and U.S. 26, in the interchange and south to Barbur, don't make it even more difficult for drivers to get to and from the Ross Island Bridge. If there were roundabouts instead of the proposed four-way intersections with stoplights, that would be far better by having smoother traffic, and there'd be room for them with all the assumed roadway demolition.
- Regionwide items:
 - Youth Transit Access: I'd be willing to tax myself for a lot, but not free bus and MAX fares for school-aged youth. Someone else can buy their passes, like their parents. The other items better need money anyway.
 - Planning for the Future: The description is too vague. Explain better as the vote nears.
 - Add an item: A road with sidewalk bridge across the Willamette spanning Wilsonville and Charbonneau. This would relieve traffic that must otherwise take I-5 just to cross the river because the other crossings are ridiculously far away east at I-205 and west at Highway 219. It would also allow walkers and cyclists, sometimes seen on the I-5 Boones Bridge shoulders, to take that safe, calmer, local bridge. The bridge could connect SW Ross Lane and SW Gordon Lane or similar, or, SW Boones Ferry Road and NE Butteville Road or similar. I

also think an improvement in this area will plug a gap apparent looking at the map of geographic items, winning more of the Tualatin, Wilsonville, and Charbonneau vote.

- Add another item: Add a road with sidewalk bridge across the Willamette and located somewhere between the Sellwood and the I-205 bridge. How about at Highway 43 and A Avenue in Lake Oswego? I know the city would probably be cranky about that, but nonetheless a bridge is a regional necessity and would be a great benefit. Elsewhere a little farther south, with the closure of Marylhurst University, a road with sidewalk could continue through the rest of campus up and over the river east to somewhere to get to SE River Road, which has side roads to U.S. 99E, thereby minimizing taking of properties. A route could instead start at SE River and Concord Roads and go west, passing over Hog Island, and landing at Holy Names Drive. My main points are that it's necessary, practical, and could win votes.

Sincerely,

Colin Cortes
4704 SW Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy, Apt. 5
Portland, OR 97221-2968

Elvis Clark

Received: July 8, 2020

I oppose Metro's proposed Transportation Tax and fee Measure.

I plan to work against voter approval of Metro's proposed Transportation Measure.

I oppose any transportation package which includes the Southwest Corridor light rail extension project, as it is money with little transportation value...in fact, it will make traffic congestion on Barbur Blvd worse, not better.

The Southwest Corridor project is not only too expensive with poor return; but its main purpose is to erect a bank of 5 story mixed use apartment bulidings all along Barbur.

This increased population density will bring more vehicular traffic on Barbur and I-5, exacerbating current traffic congestion woes.

The GetMoving pages of Metro's website do not spell out the allocation of budgets for the transportation funding measure; but highlights the part about safety improvements on existing roads.

But even here, it is best to leave sidewalks and bicycle improvements to local City and County jurisdictions, because doing so eliminates Metro's costs of administering and managing such efforts. Eliminating Metro saves significant dollars to be applied to safety improvements by cities and counties.

Again, the Southwest corridor worsens traffic rather than improves it and on top of this most hours of the day outside of rush hour, the Max lines are mostly serving but a hand full of riders. Running these ghost-like traings all through the night is probably more energy intensive per ride than if a ride sharing company were called to take the few passengers needing a ride.

Bottom line we do not need another ghost train line called the Southwest Corridor project.

Sincerely,

Elvis Clark
Milwaukie, Oregon



John

Received: July 10, 2020

Hi There,

I was once an enthusiastic "yes" vote for the measure but will now vote no and tell others to do the same. While I do believe that this package is vitally necessary for the region, the funding mechanism for which Metro went with spoils the whole initiative for me. A payroll tax...in a Covid-crippled economy would be a disastrous move. It should have been a tax on the huge corporations in the area that have been raking in profits while small businesses collapse. Something, anything that isn't so regressive. It's a shame because I want all of the projects to move ahead but the funding is so out of sync with what people need right now I can't justify voting yes. I am sorry.

Best,

-John

John Colgan

Received: July 10, 2020

I've been a resident of Washington county for about 6 years now and live in Cornelius. I wanted to share a couple of things that I think should be addressed more explicitly.

Big idea: It is plain that the traditional concept of buying a house wherever and then driving back and forth to your place of employment ten times a week in a car with one or two people in it hasn't worked out well for our environment. What is included in this proposal that will actually get cars off of the road? I am loath to invest any more money in making roads wider to allow more cars when cars are causing so much environmental damage. How can we encourage people to work closer to where they live? If not that, how can we encourage them to use mass/public transit instead of their personal vehicle? It's got to be addressed. Electric cars may help this but they don't address the social problems that accompany our commuter culture, the energy used to produce them, and the generation and distribution of the electricity to power those vehicles.

Little idea: Tri-Met needs to be funded but it should be free to those who can't afford it easily and it should be good enough (and cheap enough) to encourage people to leave their car at home. What if an Oregon vehicle registration included trimet access? It's not a matter of affording the bus pass for me, but I still know that I'm spending \$5 when I ride which makes it a little tougher every time I leave my car at home. If my wife is going with me (or vice-versa) then that becomes \$10. That's more than parking in downtown Portland. I'm already paying for Tri-Met, why should I have to pay for it again and it's still not free to the people who need it most?

Thank you,
John Colgan
Cornelius OR

End.