

Transportation Funding Task Force

Meeting 18

February 19th, 2020



Sent: 1/16/2020  
From: Jeff C Burns  
Subject: Regarding a 2020 Bond measure

Dear Metro,

Regarding a 2020 Bond measure, I'd have a hard time getting behind it.

Some projects are in the works and feel that they need to get up and running and fully vetted to determine impacts, needs, and solutions. Those include the Rose colored painted bus lanes; the Division street rapid bus lane; troubleshoot zero vision to get the numbers in line with the vision; vet the I-5 Vancouver connection; construct the I-5 Rose Quarter bypass.

I feel those project successes could help inform a future bond measure that could be supported by voters.

Thanks!

jeff c burns . architect  
[www.organicmodern.com](http://www.organicmodern.com)  
503.351.6553

---

Sent: 1/16/2020  
From: Drew Thompson  
Subject: Tri-Met Public Comment

Dear Metro,

My name is Drew Thompson and I am resident of Hillsboro. Who lived extensively overseas.

Having seen and experienced a world-class transportation infrastructure, I feel that the MAX extension to Tigard is a mistake. Instead of the SW corridor MAX extension We should be looking at ways to increase ridership along the lines we already have. My suggestion is twofold: Extend MAX to Vancouver, and FINALLY develop some express capabilities for the red/blue lines. In Japan I could catch an express that hit only a few stops, and switch to a local from there. Compare the following:

- A trip from my house to Pioneer Copurthouse Square by car takes 20 minutes to cover 13 miles.
- The above trip driving to a park and ride and taking MAX takes about an hour.
- A trip from where I used to live into the Tokyo downtown core took 35 minutes to cover 22 miles.

Right now when I need to go into Portland I almost always drive because it takes 40 minutes on MAX but 20 minutes in a car. It's closer to parity for the ride itself during rush hour, but the

intermodality in Hillsboro is frankly appalling. It takes 30-50 minutes to get to my closest MAX station by bus or walking, erasing any savings from leaving the car at home.

However, if I could be reasonably assured that the train would only stop at Willow Creek, Beaverton TC, Sunset TC, and Washington Park before hitting the downtown core then it would reduce that 40 minute trip to 15 and more people would ride to and from work. Every other minimally developed surface rail system in Europe and Asia has dedicated express bypass lanes for this very reason. But then again Tri-met hasn't figured out how to put change machines in their buses yet so I'm not optimistic.

Adding express functionality and extending MAX to Vancouver is one of the only ways to reduce congestion in town and along the I-5 bridge and through the Beaverton corridor. It's a better use of funding than building a train to duplicate 99w.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my comments.

Best regards,  
-Drew Thompson

---

Sent: 1/21/2020

From: Justin Burger

Subject: Feedback on "Corridors" plan

Hello,

I'm a Portland City resident (SE Portland [FoPo!]). I'm beyond concerned about the modifications to key Corridors within the city to "Prioritize" public transit.

I spent 10 years commuting downtown to my office on the bus (#9) and Max when I lived in Beaverton. I've also ridden my bike, driven a car and ridden my motorcycle. This plan seems to attempt to convert people into "public transit riders" by making the drive times miserable for non-public transit. I think this strategy completely misses why people don't take the bus to work, and increasing their commute times won't solve the problem:

The Public transit system here, paired with the serious home less crisis makes riding the bus, at a minimum a horrible experience and, in many cases, has been downright unsafe. Even if the bus was faster than driving to work (which it will never be), I, along with many of my co-workers would not change our method of transport. There's many reasons public transport does not work for the majority of this city, and it's not as simple as "Make it go to more places and make it faster"

My previous employer offered free public transit passes and started charging a hefty fee to park at our office. The end result: no increase in public transit use. In fact, to this day, the office has a waiting list for parking. People are willing to pay more for the convenience and safety they get from NOT using public transit.

I don't want my commute to work to be an "Adventure". I have numerous anecdotes about people I've had to "experience" when riding public transit.

Making these changes, so drastically really shows the cities disdain for anyone who does not agree with their European city model. If the City wanted more ridership, perhaps focus on the things that DO actually increase it's use: Extend the hours so it's running when people need it most. Add additional patrols of the public transit network to make it at least appear to be safer, enforce basic traffic laws that have caused so much of the traffic headaches (I see people running red lights daily).

I'm sure this email will fall on deaf eyes, but I'd ask one thing: At least look at this plan from the perspective of the vast majority of people who WILL NOT change their commuting habits, even if commute times are doubled. It's not just "extreme right wing" citizens that disagree with this plan. It's the middle class who's just trying to get to and from work everyday.

---

Sent: 1/23/2020

From: Alex Kaiser

Subject: Transportation Bill

Good afternoon,

My name is Alex Kaiser and I am in District 4 of the Metro region. After reviewing the proposed projects that this Transportation bond would be used for, I am quite frankly disappointed by how little of the money will be used for pedestrian and bike safety as well as public transportation. I saw far too many projects focused on road expansions and construction. Unless these projects are aimed at increasing safety, I am not in support of this.

Generally speaking, road construction is a poor investment. Metro, Portland, and Oregon as a State strives to reduce carbon emissions, and increase walkability, bikeability, safety, and public transportation all with protecting the environment in mind. Increasing road capacity will not accomplish our goals enough. I am in no way saying I don't want any type of road construction as some is pertinent for the movement of traffic and safety.

For example, Tualatin Valley is a road that I know is included in this budget but I'd like to stress the importance of improving this road's safety for pedestrians and bicycles. Just earlier this week, a pedestrian was struck and killed trying to cross the highway to a bus stop where there wasn't a crosswalk for about a 1/4 mile in each direction. TV highway even completely lacks sidewalks on some sections causing extreme concern for anyone trying to bike or walk it. Have you considered a multiuse trail path adjacent to TV highway and the nearby train-tracks? This type of separation from such a busy road might be the right approach here.

That being said, I'm not totally sure I'd vote for this come in November if so much of it is going to road construction. I'd like to see at least 10% more of the budget allocated to public transportation and safety improvements. Please consider this as a second option to the currently proposed budget. Portland and Metro both have strong goals of protecting the environment and working toward sustainability. This current proposed usage of the budget does not strive to reach those goals. Instead, it's a near miss.

Thank you,

Alex Kaiser

---

Sent: 1/26/2020

From: Anthony E Lester

Subject: "Yes!" to the OGLO Bike/Pedestrian Bridge

Dear all,

I have lived in and near the Oak Grove area for more than 40 years (I lived on Sterling Circle in Oak Grove from March of '79 to January of '87; I've been in my current house off Hill Road since January of '87). I am a bike rider and my wife and I are avid walkers. We like to have places to walk and ride close to home and we would love having the stores, shops, and restaurants of Lake Oswego within walking distance of our home. The purpose of this email is to encourage you to continue studying the OGLO Bike/Pedestrian Bridge and to ultimately build the bridge.

I believe the bridge should be built as a bike/pedestrian facility and that it should be constructed such that in case of an emergency or natural disaster it could be accessed by and heavy duty enough to carry emergency vehicles. I do not believe the bridge project should give any consideration to the bridge carrying TriMet buses or light rail, it should be a bike/pedestrian facility only.

I know there is a current push by some of my neighbors and local area residents to change the scope of the study to include a ferry system of some sort. I DO NOT support a ferry system, I support the bridge.

My first choice would be the C Avenue to SE Courtney alignment. My second choice would be the Terwilliger Blvd. to SE Courtney alignment.

Thank you for reading my email and considering my input.

Anthony Lester

14281 SE Trilva Jean Ct.  
Milwaukie, OR 97267  
Home: (503) 653-5438

Cell: (503) 703-7872  
[brranger1@comcast.net](mailto:brranger1@comcast.net)

---

Sent: 1/26/2020

From: Rich Nepon

Subject: Bridge

I support the C Avenue to Courtney alignment for the Oak Grove/Lake Oswego (OGLO) Bridge. The Terwilliger Blvd. to SE Courtney Ave alignment can easily be revised by shifting the alignment to the south onto the property of the Tryon Creek Waste water Treatment Plant. This alignment lands the bridge on the alley between 1st Street and OR 43 (State Street) on C Avenue in Lake Oswego and provides a good connection between Downtown Lake Oswego and the Trolley Trail. Ask the members of

the Policy Committee: Christine Lewis, Paul Savas, and Mark Gamba to (1) Continue the OGLO Bridge Study (2) Study the C Ave to Courtney Alignment (3) Revise the SW Terwilliger to SE Courtney Ave alignment to avoid Tryon Cove Park and to study the new alignment (4) Ask the METRO T2020 Task Force to fund the Bridge.

---

Sent: 1/26/2020

From: William Waite

Subject: OGLO Support

Just would like to voice support for the OGLO bridge study, and the C Ave. to Courtney alignment. Currently I reside at SE Laurie and SE Courtney and would love to walk with the family over the bridge to visit Laughing Planet, Manzanitas, the bakery, Nola's etc. Thanks and appreciate your work and time.

William Waite

503-939-1211

---

Sent: 1/27/2020

From: Bill Mason

Subject: OGLO Bridge

This lousy idea of a bridge no-one wants won't die. We need NO bridge from the Oak Grove area to the Lake Oswego area. None.

The city of Lake Oswego has made this clear. Clackamas County residents have made it clear, from CC's survey::

***We saw some passionate marks! Here are the services that had more than 30% of respondents rate them at a ?10? level, meaning they find them ?extremely valuable?:***

- ***Sheriff Patrols (50.13% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Sheriff Investigations (37.58% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Sheriff's Family Justice Center (37.07% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Library Systems (35.55% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***District Attorney: Criminal Prosecution (31.79% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Sheriff Support Services (31.28% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Vulnerable Child Stabilization (30.58% of ratings were ?10?)***
- ***Veterans Services (30.15% of ratings were ?10?)***
- <https://www.clackamas.us/budget/the-rightsizing-of-clackcos-budget>

Notice, not a word about wanting a useless bridge across the river?

Please go back to supporting the taxpayers instead of hoo-aying for your favorite gimmick.

Bill Mason

Milwaukie, Oregon

Sent: 1/30/2020

From: Dolores Daigle

Subject: SW Corridor Light Rail

If the goal is to relieve traffic congestion as quickly, effectively, and inexpensively as possible, the solution is not light rail, but expanded bus service. The image of buses is "boring" compared to light rail which is "cool". But just as most of us struggle to live within our means, choices have to be made between what is "cool" and what is affordable that meets the need. Buses have so many advantages over light rail, that I can't understand why that option isn't being pursued more seriously.

Buses can now be clean running, on natural gas and on battery, instead of the electricity needed to power light rail. Electricity may be cleaner than diesel, but it still has to be produced and is subject to grid overload and shutdowns. When the electricity is out, trains can't run, but buses keep going. When it gets really hot, trains slow down or stop, but buses keep going. When it is really cold and icy, trains don't go, but buses chain up and are out working. When something obstructs or is faulty on tracks, trains can't go, but a bus just takes a different road. After an earthquake, which is going to run? Trains or buses? Think about it.

The land being used to lay tracks, could become dedicated bus lanes. The addition of more bus service, dedicated lanes, and express bus service could be up and running while light rail is still being talked about, and voted on, and uncertain funding applied for. Beefing up bus service will bring traffic congestion relief much sooner, and can expand steadily and gradually, as money and construction can be put into place, while trains are still just a future dream plan.

Buses are cheaper to buy, cheaper to maintain, cheaper to repair, cheaper to replace than trains- now and in the future.

Buses are also safer for passengers. Trimet's own statistics show that crime on light rail is way out of proportion to the ridership compared to buses. This is no surprise. To get on a bus you have to show some proof of payment. Light rail uses the honor system, but by definition the honor system doesn't work for dishonorable people. Anyone can get on and ride to wherever, and they do. Buses have drivers right there with the passengers, who are immediately aware of anything happening. Light rail drivers are Way Way Way at the end of a train in a booth and have no idea what is going on in the mid-back of the train. A criminal can board at one stop, get off at the next, and be long gone, while no one knows what is/has happened except the victims in that 1 coach. The random occasional security checks are far too few to be effective and the likelihood of Trimet funding enough officers to be effective is slim to 0.

I went to the SW Corridor meeting last November which was to address the nearly half million dollar shortfall on lite rail budget. After publicly announcing that the shortfall had been reduced to only \$100 million, the new plan was announced:

Step 1 : cut \$127 million by for example not buying some of the land they had originally intended to buy. OK. That can be done.



Step2: ask for \$240 million more from their funding partners . It's not known yet if the original ask from these partners will be funded in full, in part , or at all. The assumption of Step 2 however is that not only will the original ask be fully funded, but so will the additional ask- from the same sources. This, in my experience, is not a good assumption.

Step 3 is to fund the remaining \$100 million short fall by “working on it.” Seriously.

This is not a plan. It is wishful thinking/hope for the best.

Meanwhile expanded, improved bus service would be a more practical, more versatile, more reliable, more cost effective, more immediate, and safer solution to traffic congestion .

Dolores Daigle  
Portland resident near Barbur Blvd.

---

Sent: 1/31/2020

From: Jeremy Anderson

Subject: 7 Billion Transportation Bond

I just read about the proposed funding options for the bond. A personal income tax on people making over \$100,000 is unacceptable. I worked hard for my pay and the metro area isn't cheap. I have a family of four and \$100,000 is not a lot of money. This bond won't even help my commute, as I live no where near this MAX line. Everyone Who lives in Metro should pay a tax or no one. If it's everyone, I'm in. Guaranteed no vote from both my wife and I, if you fund this on our backs!

Sincerely,

Jeremy Anderson

---



February 18, 2020

To whom it may concern,

The Clackamas County Business Alliance (CCBA) is a non-profit advocacy group supporting issues of importance to Clackamas County Businesses.

CCBA would like to express our appreciation for the process and efforts toward engagement and urge your support of Clackamas County's Tier 2 corridor, HWY 43. This important roadway extends the active transportation network in the east Metro area. Funding the \$66.1 million project on HWY 43 will transition an ODOT Highway into a complete street for travelers of all ages, abilities, backgrounds and income levels.

This region has not had any improvements for decades leading to unsafe conditions for all travelers with intermittent or substandard sidewalks, inadequate pedestrian crossings, missing left-turn bays and isolated transit stops disconnected from surrounding neighborhoods.

CCBA was pleased to see the unanimous support for \$180 million in investment on the Sunrise Corridor and is supportive of full funding for the corridor at \$477 million. Thank you and thank you for your continued interest in this critical Tier 2 project.

Please support the \$66.1 million project in full to allow the region to fill in key sections of sidewalk between residential, commercial and transit areas. The business community supports this project to increase safety, economic growth, resiliency and equity.

Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Sincerely,

Nellie deVries  
Executive Director  
Clackamas County Business Alliance  
PO Box 2156  
Lake Oswego, OR 97035  
<https://ccba.biz/>





# CITY OF West Linn

January 23, 2020

To Metro Council President Peterson, District 2 Councilor Lewis, and Metro Council:

We are writing to re-affirm the City of West Linn's strong support for inclusion of the Highway 43 project in Metro's 2020 regional transportation funding measure. With over 21,000 vehicle trips daily, Highway 43 is a major regional corridor connecting Clackamas County residents to jobs, education, and daily needs, but it lacks basic multimodal and safety elements.

Our proposed Highway 43 project will greatly enhance multimodal access and complete urgently needed safety improvements, with a focus on accessibility for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users. The project includes an innovative cycle track design, sidewalks, and transit amenities. Roundabout designs at key interchanges will improve traffic flow, safety for all users, and will reduce vehicle emissions. West Linn is committed to a Vision Zero goal and this project is a priority component of that work.

The project has a strong economic development tie as well. The City is working with regional partners on tremendously exciting redevelopment opportunities in the Willamette Falls area at the south end of Highway 43, and we are kicking off a project to evaluate increased opportunities for commercial and residential redevelopment along the entire Highway 43 commercial corridor.

Unlike many projects being submitted for your review, the Highway 43 project is nearly shovel-ready and offers a very high local match. Our citizens funded the design work through approval of a General Obligation Bond in May 2018 and we have been working with ODOT, the facility owner since that time, on design. Also the project will leverage RFFA funds allocated to Highway 43's Phase 1 which is approaching the construction phase already.

The Highway 43 multimodal project is a priority for the entire West Linn community and for stakeholders from across the region. It was the highest rated project in the City's 2018 polling prior to passage of our 2018 Bond, and would have broad voter support across Clackamas County. For all of these reasons **we urge your inclusion of the Highway 43 multimodal project in Metro's 2020 regional transportation funding measure.**

Thank you for your attention to the critical issue of transportation funding across the region. We stand ready to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Russell B. Axelrod  
Mayor

Teri Cummings  
Council President

William Relyea  
Councilor

Richard Sakelik  
Councilor

Jules Walters  
Councilor





# GETTING THERE TOGETHER

February 19, 2020

[www.gettingtheretogether.org](http://www.gettingtheretogether.org) | [info@gettingtheretogether.org](mailto:info@gettingtheretogether.org)

Dear Task Force Members,

The Getting There Together Coalition (the Coalition) formed in 2017 in response to growing concerns that the Portland metropolitan region wasn't adequately planning to build the comprehensive infrastructure and transportation system in a way that effectively responds to the needs of people who live, work, learn, practice spiritually, and play in the Metro region. The Coalition is comprised of more than 60 member- and mission-based organizations in the region that work with stakeholders, businesses, and community members, including communities of color, transit riders, youth, older adults, people with disabilities, and the most vulnerable users of the roadway and transportation system.

## **Tier 2 Corridors | How We Evaluated These Investments**

As the Task Force learns about and considers Tier 2 projects for inclusion in a 2020 regional transportation measure, the Coalition urges you to use the same lens we have been using in our recommendations that center the community and Task Force values of affordability, safety, racial equity, and providing our communities with real transportation options.

For Tier 2 projects, we evaluated each project through the same list of screening questions as with Tier 1 projects to analyze the projects based on values-based criteria. Below are the analysis questions used in all project analysis:

### **On Equity:**

- Does this investment/corridor prioritize community priorities as reflected by public input and testimony?
- Is this a project/need identified by communities of color, low-income communities, and other historically marginalized groups?
- Does this project/corridor prioritize the needs of underserved, low-income and communities of color?
  - Location: Is this project near places that these communities live or travel to regularly?
  - Asking the question: Who are these investments for?
- Does this project prioritize equity outcomes for seniors and people with disabilities?

### **On Safety:**

- Is this project along/near a high-crash corridor?
- Does this project address pedestrian/bicyclist safety? Which one?
- If a safety crossing, is the project near a bus stop?
- If a safety crossing, is the project near a school, grocery store, senior center, cultural center, park, or place of worship?
- If a safety crossing, is it a stop light, flashing beacon, or something else (preference for a stop light)?

On Affordability:

- Is this investment/corridor located within ¼ mile (5-minute walk/roll) of current existing, planned, or public affordable housing?

On Climate/Transit:

- Does this project expand (or plan to expand in the future) roadway capacity in any way besides adding transit capacity, bicycle facilities, or sidewalk connectivity?
- Would this investment help reduce VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and climate emissions?
- Would/could this investment result in increased transit ridership?
- Would/could this investment result in faster, more reliable transit?
- If this is a transit investment, does it prioritize underserved, low-income, and/or communities of color?
- If this is a transit investment, does it prioritize the needs of people with disabilities?
- If this is a transit investment, is it located along a route that is a part of TriMet’s service enhancement plan?
- Does this project/corridor have appropriate land use policies and zoning to support new/expanded transit service?

**Tier 2 Corridors | Preliminary Observations**

There still remain many important considerations in shaping the final version of this measure; some projects are currently included in the measure that the Coalition opposes because they do not meet our principles nor the Task Force’s values, and some projects that meet the Task Force’s values remain unfunded. We therefore thought it most fair to elevate all Tier 2 corridors that comply with our criteria and align with The Task Force’s values.

T2 Corridors We Tentatively Recommend:

- Highway 43 Multimodal Improvements:
  - The Coalition felt that the investments on this corridor would most benefit people walking and bicycling, fulfilling safety and connection needs in this part of the region.
  - While the nature of the investments meets our climate/transit criteria, these projects would likely not primarily serve low income and communities of color, which should be taken into account in prioritization of Tier 2 corridors.
- Highway 99 Multimodal Corridor Planning:
  - The Coalition supports corridor planning done by Metro on this corridor, ensuring planning prioritizes the needs of marginalized communities, prioritizes sustainable multimodal

investments, and demonstrates how planning recommendations will reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) on the corridor.

- Highway 26 Multimodal Corridor Planning:
  - The Coalition supports corridor planning done by Metro on this corridor, ensuring planning prioritizes the needs of marginalized communities, prioritizes sustainable multimodal investments, and demonstrates how planning recommendations will reduce VMT on the corridor.

#### T2 Corridors We Will Not Support:

- State Highway 217:
  - From our preliminary analysis, this corridor does not meet coalition values:
    - This project supports roadway expansion, which is proven to not reduce congestion in both the long and short term, and increases the total VMT of a corridor in the long run, which only further contributes to the climate crisis.
    - This project is absorbently expensive, and would do little to improve regional trips for Portland Metro Area Commuters.

#### **What We Still Oppose in the Measure**

The coalition continues to not have a final stance on the entire measure. We will keep shedding light on aspects of Metro's 2020 transportation measure that do not stand true to the Task Force and coalition values. Our analysis indicates that the Airport Way Project, with a project cost of \$40M, and Sunrise Right of Way Acquisition, with a cost of \$70M, both represent potential opportunities to instead fund Tier 2 corridors that better align with the Measure's goals, or additional regional program investments. We encourage you to be a loud voice in recommending only those investments that best reflect community needs and the values of the Task Force and Metro Council.

#### **Thank You!**

As we begin to move closer to the final stages of the Task Force process, we want to thank you as members for your time and dedication to our region. The questions put before the task force on this measure's projects, now funding mechanisms, and in the future programs are all complicated. The Coalition continues to feel that a collaborative process rooted in the Task Force's values of safety, climate action, and particularly racial equity in regards to this measure's funding mechanisms, is the best way to create a T2020 measure that can aspire to and achieve something transformational for everyday Oregonians.

Sincerely,  
The Getting There Together Coalition