

Final Memo #3A: Goals and Prioritization Criteria



November 26, 2024

Project# 27003.12

To: Jay Higgins and Carly Rice; City of Gresham

Glen Bolen and Molly McCormick; Oregon Department of Transportation

From: Susan Wright, PE, PMP, Krista Purser, PE, Sutapa Banerjee; Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

RE: Gresham TSP 2045 Update

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Proposed Goal Language.....	1
State Prioritization Factors.....	3
Recommended Prioritization Criteria.....	3
Initial Suggested Goal Language.....	7

Introduction

This memorandum shows proposed goal language and prioritization criteria based on statewide transportation planning rules (TPR), local practices, and feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), and community. These criteria will be shared again during Public Outreach #2 and revised for use in prioritizing project lists. The initial goals and TAC, SAC, and public feedback are shown in Appendix A.

Proposed Goal Language

Table 1 lists the goals from the existing TSP under nine categories along with the proposed changes based on Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), and public discussion and feedback on the goals and priorities that helped to inform these changes. The goals will be used to guide prioritization of projects and ongoing decision-making for the City.

Table 1. Suggested Goals Language

Goal	Existing Goal Language	Action based on TAC, SAC, and Public Feedback	Proposed Goal Language
ACCESSIBILITY	Providing the ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations with relative ease, within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost and with reasonable choices.	Combine these goals. Reword accessibility goal description to elevate travel by all modes.	Providing the ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations with relative ease, within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost and with a full range of mode choices.
EFFICIENCY	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that performs and functions as fluidly as possible.	CONNECTIVITY, MOBILITY, AND ACCESSIBILITY	
LIVABILITY	Tying the quality and location of transportation facilities to broader opportunities such as access to good jobs, affordable housing, quality schools and safe streets.		
MOBILITY	Moving people and goods to destinations efficiently and reliably.		
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that supports new business as well as business retention, expansion and relocation.		Maintain as-is: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP	Meeting the transportation needs of the community present generation without compromising future needs and resources	Reword goal and its description to capture broader climate needs. CLIMATE ACTION	Meeting the transportation needs of the community and minimizing adverse effects on the climate.
HEALTHY EQUITY	Promoting health with adequate biking and walking routes and trails among all transportation system users.	Reframe goal and its description to focus on equity. EQUITY	Providing all community members access to safe, comfortable, affordable, sustainable, and reliable transportation choices to meet their daily transportation needs.
SAFETY	Minimizing dangers or risks in the transportation system so users feel safe driving, biking, walking and taking transit.	Maintain, update description to promote elimination of fatalities and serious injuries. SAFETY	Eliminating all transportation-related serious injury and fatal crashes through design, education, and enforcement.
SUSTAINABLE FUNDING	Ensuring the establishment of funding mechanisms sufficient to support the continuous and safe operation of the transportation system.	Remove as a goal. Funding is the mechanism for completing projects and programs, but not a lens to prioritize the projects themselves.	N/A

State Prioritization Factors

Evaluation criteria must incorporate the prioritization factors included in OAR 660-012-0155, OAR 660-012-0520, OAR 660-012-0620, OAR 660-012-0720, and OAR 660-012-0820, shown below:

- Vehicle Projects
 - Reallocate right-of-way from facilities dedicated to moving motor vehicles to those for use by the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation systems in regional and town centers,
 - Improve safety in areas with concentrations of underserved populations
 - Improve safety in areas with reported crashes involving serious injuries and deaths.
 - Fill gaps in the existing street network
 - Support meeting the rule -0910 performance targets associated with Metro's greenhouse gas reduction strategy. STATE
- Active Transportation
 - Are located in regional and town centers
 - Are located in areas with concentrations of underserved populations
 - Are located in areas with safety risk factors such as roadways with high speeds and high traffic volumes
 - Are located in areas with reported crashes involving serious injuries and deaths to people walking and/or people riding bicycles
 - Provide access to key destinations such as transit stations and stops, parks and recreational areas, grocery stores and services, major employment areas, and other civic and public resources.
 - Connect to, fill gaps in, and expand the existing system networks
- Transit Projects (currently in both vehicle and active transportation lists)
 - Are located in regional and town centers
 - Are located in areas with concentrations of underserved populations
 - Provide access to key destinations such as transit stations and stops, parks and recreational areas, grocery stores and services, major employment areas, and other civic and public resources.
 - Connect to, fill gaps in, or expand the existing public transportation network

Recommended Prioritization Criteria

Table 2 shows the proposed goals language, alignment to state prioritization factors, and recommended prioritization criteria considering local feedback. These factors will be used to evaluate and prioritize the project lists. Projects identified within the Metro 2023 RTP may use RTP results that are related to these criteria.

Table 2. Recommended Prioritization Criteria

Goal	Proposed Goal Language	Example CFEC Alignment – Vehicle Criteria	Prioritization Method
CONNECTIVITY, MOBILITY, AND ACCESSIBILITY	Providing the ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations with relative ease, within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost and with a full range of mode choices.	Reallocate right-of-way from facilities dedicated to moving motor vehicles to those for use by the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation systems in regional and town centers	<p>Vehicle – Reallocation (mapping exercise):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this project reallocate right-of-way in regional and town centers? (High) Does this project reallocate outside of these centers? (Medium) Does this project not reallocate right-of-way? (Low) <p>Walking and Biking – Access (mapping exercise)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this project within ¼ mile of a high-capacity transit stop, school, library, park, grocery store, or other key activity center? (High) Is this project within ½ mile of a high-capacity transit stop, school, library, park, grocery store or other key activity center? (Medium) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Is this project elsewhere? (Low)
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that supports new business as well as business retention, expansion and relocation.	Fill gaps in the existing street network	<p>Network completeness (qualitative exercise, compared to Metro RTP results):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Does this project fill in gaps in existing or planned urban centers? (High) ■ Does this project fill in gaps within ¼ mile of a high-capacity transit stop, school, library, park, or grocery store? (Medium) ■ Does this project fill in gaps elsewhere? (Low) <p>Freight (Metro Regional Freight Map¹)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Is the project along a freight roadway connector and within an industrial area? (High) ■ Is the project along a freight roadway connector outside of an industrial area? (Medium) ■ Is the project not along a freight corridor? (Low)
CLIMATE ACTION	Meeting the transportation needs of the community and minimizing adverse effects on the climate.	Support meeting the rule -0910 performance targets associated with Metro’s greenhouse gas reduction strategy.	<p>VMT (qualitative exercise, compared to Metro RTP results):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Does this project reduce vehicle miles traveled? (High) ■ Does this project promote non-single-occupancy trips or have no or little impact to VMT? (Medium) ■ Does this project increase VMT? (Low)
EQUITY	Providing all community members access to safe, comfortable, affordable, sustainable, and reliable transportation choices to meet their daily transportation needs.	Improve safety in areas with concentrations of underserved populations	<p>Equity (Metro Equity Focus Areas, calibrated to Gresham City Limits²):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Is the project in the highest tiers of the index? (High) ■ Is the project in the middle tiers of the index? (Medium) ■ Is the project in the lowest tiers of the index? (Low)
SAFETY	Eliminating all transportation-related serious injury and fatal crashes through design, education, and enforcement.	Improve safety in areas with reported crashes involving serious injuries and deaths.	<p>Safety (state and local crash severity index for fatalities and serious injuries data):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Does the project improve safety in the top high injury corridors? (High) ■ Does the project improve safety in other high injury corridors? (Medium) ■ Does the project not improve safety? (Low)

¹ https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2019/05/17/Regional-freight-maps_Page_1.png

² <https://regionalbarometer.oregonmetro.gov/datasets/drcMetro::all-equity-focus-areas/about>

Appendix A. Existing Gresham TSP Policies.

Appendix B. TAC, SAC and Public Feedback

Initial Suggested Goal Language

Table 1 lists the goals from the existing TSP under nine categories along with the initial proposed changes and the reason for the change.

TAC

The members of the Technical Advisory Committee were provided with the existing and proposed changes to the goal language of the TSP. They were also asked to rank the top three goals that were of utmost importance for the City. The ranking exercise resulted in the top three goals being 1) Safety, 2) Accessibility, and 3) Equity. Sustainable Funding, Mobility, and Climate Adaptation ranked in the medium priority range and Livability, Efficiency, and Economic Development ranked in the end. Specific comments made during the TAC meeting included the following thoughts:

- The goal topic headers were the first point of discussion. A few of the goal headers implied very similar meaning such as- Livability & Accessibility, Mobility & Accessibility and Efficiency & Accessibility. They could often be used interchangeably due to the similarities in their meaning and conceptually had large overlapping ideas. The general consensus was to differentiate the words enough for them to be distinct.
- One of the goals that did not make it into the top three ranking was Sustainable Funding. There was some discussion about the maintenance backlog that exists within the projects of the city and developing streams of funding sources was crucial for developing infrastructure that lasts. In the end, it was decided that Sustainable Funding may be better removed as a goal and noted that funding is a key factor to drive any project forward.
- TAC recommended that goals like Equity and Sustainable Funding be infused throughout all goal areas as they form the basis and an underlying key component of all the other goals. In the same way Health and Equity were also considered major components that could be worked into each goal instead of the previous goal of 'Healthy Equity'.
- Safety was a goal that ranked in top three priorities; however, no crash patterns were identified for fatal and injury crashes which makes prioritizing projects difficult. Severe crashes tend to be random. Therefore, it was decided that the main goal was to identify systemic safety issues and the common denominator between crashes. Eliminating crashes was the top priority for the TAC. The 'Safety' section later in this memorandum will expand on this topic.
- The Economic development goal brought on questions about the approach to new development. It brought on discussion about whether developing new corridors and roadways would be more important at this stage or if allocating funds for revitalizing existing roadways was a better approach for the City. Redevelopment and infill development are important development strategies for a city to work efficiently. Different approaches can include- redevelopment, revitalizing, infill development or funds can be directed towards entirely new projects and developing new areas. It was noted that the Economic Development goal needs to include considerations for Equity.
- Transportation systems facilitate economic development. These are two sides of the same coin but not independent of one another. They need to be strategically studied to identify new growth areas in the city and its vicinity.

SAC

The members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee were also provided with the existing and proposed changes to the goal language of the TSP. They were also asked to rank the top three goals that were of utmost importance for the City. The ranking exercise resulted in the top three goals being 1) Safety and Equity ranked the highest followed by 2) Sustainable Funding and Livability. Then came 3) Economic Development, Climate Adaptation and Accessibility. Mobility and Efficiency did not have any votes.

- Equity and Safety were considered the top goals. Considering them a filter for all other goals was also brought up during the meeting. However, it was finally agreed that both the goals should be standalone goals and appear in the actions of the other goals in order for them to be taken seriously and implemented.
- Goals were often used interchangeably tied but most SAC members resonated to creating a place that is livable, accessible, and climate resilient.
- Each goal header and its definition were discussed and contested whether it conveys the right meaning for the community or not. For example- Livability engulfs multiple of these areas. For a city to be livable, it needs to be accessible, climate, adaptation, economic opportunities etc. Livability, accessibility, and mobility converge together.
- Various SAC members were surprised with climate adaptation having no priority stickers despite climate adaptation having a lot of work to do.
- Some members stayed away from putting stickers on safety as it seems like a safe community to them.
- It was agreed that in reality all goals were priorities that the city needs to work on and economic development and sustainable funding is needed for all.
- It was found that some of these goals were directly proportional to each other. For example, if you increase livability, it will benefit equity at the same time.
- Equity needs to be embedded in everything. However, if it's not a standalone goal then it won't be prioritized. Gets missed in prioritization. It needs to permeate into all the other goals.
- The paradoxical nature of achieving one goal that automatically does not align with the other was brought up. One of the examples that were discussed related to equity not being as easy to achieve was that congestion pricing does not seem equitable, but we may need it to fund sustainable funding. Only the individuals from higher socioeconomic class will be able to afford congestion pricing and travel whenever they wanted. This excludes other people but is crucial to obtain funding for other projects. Equity conversation also brings economic status since that is a way to measure it.

Public Feedback

During Outreach #1, the community confirmed that the goals of safety and equity were important values for the City to prioritize throughout the TSP. While less highly ranked, livability, economic opportunities, and climate action were important to many respondents.

Table 3. Initial Suggested Goals Language

Goal	Existing Goal Language and Redline Edits	Proposed Goal Language	Reason for change
ACCESSIBILITY	Providing the ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations with relative ease, within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost and with reasonable reasonable <u>a full range of mode</u> choices.	Providing the ability to reach desired goods, services, activities and destinations with relative ease, within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost and with a full range of mode choices.	Elevates the concept of accessibility across various transportation modes.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that supports new business as well as business retention, expansion and relocation.	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that supports new business as well as business retention, expansion and relocation.	No change
EFFICIENCY	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that performs and functions as fluidly as possible.	Constructing and maintaining a transportation system that performs and functions as fluidly as possible.	No change
ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP CLIMATE ADAPTATION	Meeting the transportation needs of the community present generation without compromising future needs and resources <u>and minimizing adverse effects on the climate.</u>	Meeting the transportation needs of the community and minimizing adverse effects on the climate.	Broaden to target climate change and develop strategies to mitigate its effects.
HEALTHY EQUITY	Promoting health with adequate biking and walking routes and trails among all transportation system users. <u>Providing all community members access to safe, comfortable, and reliable transportation choices to meet their daily transportation needs.</u>	Providing all community members -- regardless of race, economic status, age, and ability -- access to safe, comfortable, affordable, sustainable, and reliable transportation choices to meet their daily transportation needs.	Include Equity with a broader intersectional lens.
LIVABILITY	Tying the quality and location of transportation facilities to broader opportunities such as access to	Tying the quality and location of transportation facilities to broader opportunities such as access	No change

Goal	Existing Goal Language and Redline Edits	Proposed Goal Language	Reason for change
	good jobs, affordable housing, quality schools and safe streets.	to good jobs, affordable housing, quality schools and safe streets.	
MOBILITY	Moving people and goods to destinations efficiently and reliably.	Moving people and goods to destinations efficiently and reliably.	No change
SAFETY	Minimizing dangers or risks in the transportation system so users feel safe driving, biking, walking and taking transit. <u>Eliminating all transportation-related serious injury and fatal crashes through design, education, and enforcement.</u>	Eliminating all transportation-related serious injury and fatal crashes through design, education, and enforcement.	Promote elimination (rather than reduction) of severe crashes.
SUSTAINABLE FUNDING	Ensuring the establishment of funding mechanisms sufficient to support the continuous and safe operation <u>and maintenance</u> of the transportation system.	Ensuring the establishment of funding mechanisms sufficient to support the continuous and safe operation and maintenance of the transportation system.	Prioritize maintenance of existing facilities and consider maintenance when constructing new facilities.