



Engagement report

Public comments on proposed projects
for Step 2 2028-30 Regional Flexible
Funds.

May 2025

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

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 strives for 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. Together, JPACT and the Metro Council serve as the MPO board for the region in a unique partnership that requires joint action on all MPO decisions. This means JPACT approves MPO decisions and submits them to the Metro Council for adoption. The Metro Council will adopt the recommended action or refer it back to JPACT with a recommendation for amendment.

Project web site: oregonmetro.gov/rffa

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

The preparation of this engagement report 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 report are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Notice and Invitation to Participate.....	4
Translation	5
Comments.....	6
Summary of Project Comments	6
Online Tool Participants.....	8
Project Application Public Comment Profiles	11

Appendix A: Notices and invitations to participate

Appendix B: Comments received, email

Appendix C: Comments received, mailed letters and phone calls

Appendix D: Public testimony

Appendix E: Comments received, online comment survey

Appendix F: 2028-2030 RFFA applicant community involvement application questions

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

INTRODUCTION

Every three years, Metro leads a discussion among the region's residents, jurisdictional and public agency staff, and elected officials to select which transportation needs are to be funded with the region's allotment of federal transportation dollars, known as the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA).

Regional Flexible Funds comprise of two federal grant programs:

- Surface Transportation Block Grant funds may be used for projects to preserve and improve conditions and performance on public roads, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects.
- Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program funds may be used for surface transportation projects and other related efforts that reduce air pollution from transportation sources and provide congestion relief.

Metro is currently deciding how to invest federal funding available in the federal fiscal years 2028 through 2030. A portion of these funds – approximately \$42 million – is targeted towards local jurisdiction led improvements to streets and trails throughout the region through a competitive process. This targeted part is known as the Step 2 of the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation.

The estimated total funding to be allocated in this process is between \$150 - \$153 million. While this amount of regional funding is small relative to the scale of all the dollars spent on transportation in the region, the Regional Flexible Funds are eligible to be spent on a wide range of transportation system needs. As such, they are a critical part of fulfilling the vision, goals, and objectives of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

From March 26th through April 30th, 2025, residents of the Portland metropolitan region were asked to provide comment on the 24 applications competing in the Step 2 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation process. These comments will help decide how an estimated \$42 million in Step 2 Regional Flexible Funds will be spent on projects that will help make the region's transportation system more equitable, safer, cleaner and more reliable.

During this public comment period:


- Participants provided 1,683 project rating responses through an online interactive map and survey available in English and Spanish. One project rating response was submitted in Spanish. See Figure 1.

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

- Of the 1,683 participants, 332 provided responses on optional demographic questions.
- A JPACT public hearing was held on April 17, 2025.
 - 4 people testified through oral testimony, commenting on 3 projects, several of which were the same project.
 - 3 emailed testimonies were received, not including testimonies emailed by public agencies.
- 4 email comments, not including those emailed comments from public agencies, were received.
- No mailed letters or voicemail comments were received.

In addition, public comments were received via 2 emails, and 6 testimony (oral and written) from public agency partners.

Fig. 1. Number of Responses to the Online Public Comment by County



NOTICE AND INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

The notice and invitation to participate were distributed through several channels:

- Email to community involvement offices and community participation organizations*

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

- An email to Metro's transportation interested persons email list
- CORE members email*
- Metro News (<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/news/public-notice-opportunity-comment-transportation-projects-submitted-2028-30-regional-flexible>)
- Metro News public hearing announcement (<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/news/public-hearing-notice-comment-2028-30-regional-flexible-funding-allocation-process-jpact>)
- Metro's social media channels on Facebook and Instagram
- Oregon Trails Coalition email list
- Metro Parks & Nature Department hosted Quarterly Trails Forum announcements*
- Email invitation to committee members and interested persons for the Metro Council, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, Metro Policy Advisory Committee, Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee and Metro Technical Advisory Committee

See Appendix A: Notices and invitations to participate. Those denoted with * are not included in Appendix A.

People were invited to learn about the projects via:

- The 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds web page ([oregonmetro.gov/rffa](https://www.oregonmetro.gov/rffa)), which featured the technical scoring results of the applications and project factsheets for the 24 proposed projects.
- An interactive public comment survey available in English and Spanish. The online public comment survey provided an introduction of the Step 2 allocation and see a map of the proposed projects. Each proposed project had a short summary available when selected. Participants were able to choose which projects they wanted to learn more about and then rate and comment on their projects of interest.

Comments were accepted through:

- the interactive comment survey, linked from the Metro website
- by email to transportation@oregonmetro.gov or rffa@oregonmetro.gov
- by letters to 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR, 97232
- by phone at 503-797-1750 or TDD 503-797-1804

Translation

The interactive public comment tool was translated into Spanish.

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

To increase the visibility of the public comment period, Metro posted on social media (Facebook and Instagram) in Spanish and English. The posts reached a total of 2,686 people and garnered 59 link clicks and interactions. The social media posts are included in Appendix A: Notices and invitations to participate.

Of the total public comment survey participants, one person participated in the Spanish survey.

COMMENTS

From March 26th through April 30th, 2025, residents of the Portland metropolitan region were asked to comment on the 24 candidate projects competing for the estimated \$42 million in Step 2 Regional Flexible Funds available.

Metro received:

- Participants provided 1,683 project rating responses through an interactive comment map available in English and Spanish. There was one response in Spanish.
- 4 email comments, not including public agencies, were received.
 - 1 provided general, non-project specific comments and 3 provided project specific comments. The majority were concerned and 1 was supportive.
- No phone calls, voicemails or post was received.

For the full text of these comments, see Appendices B through E.


Summary of Project Comments

The online tool asked participants to rate any number of the 24 projects on a scale of one to five, with five being “highly supportive” and one being “lesser support.” Participants were also given the option to provide additional written comments on the projects. Of the respondents who rated projects, 75.1% took the extra time to provide written comments. Those written comments are included in Appendix E. In total, Metro received 1,683 project rating responses through the online survey and 1,265 in online written comments.

Across all projects, the average rating is 4.15 with 85% of the project rating responses receiving a four (4) or a five (5). Figure 2 outlines the number of responses and the average score for each of the individual projects.

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Figure. 2: Number of Project Rating Responses with Average Rating Score
Ordered from highest to lowest by the number of project ratings received



Overall, almost all the comments people provided through the online survey, emails, and letters supported specific projects. That said, 14.6% of the project rating responses gave a score of three (3) or less, indicating neutral to lesser support for a project.

Among the supportive written comments Metro received across the Step 2 applications, the common themes to emerge include:

- The impact of the project on transportation safety for all users, but with a particular focus on pedestrians;
- The impact of the project on making more seamless connections for people traveling to and from places regardless the form of travel taken.

Among the concerned comments received across the Step 2 applications, the common theme to emerge include:

- The concern of prioritizing specific types of projects or using public funds on certain types of projects over other competing transportation needs.

ONLINE TOOL PARTICIPANTS

People who responded using the online public comment survey were asked to respond to demographic questions that help Metro and others looking at the public comment results determine whether we heard from a representative group of people reflecting the region's diverse communities and broad range of experiences. The questions are optional for the online public comment survey participants.

There is typically an opt-in bias that occurs with online engagement opportunities like this one. This often results in an over-representation of people who have the time, comfort and access to participate. Participation skews toward higher income people who speak English and have a level of trust in governments. Groups that are underrepresented in respondent information by four (4) percent or more are indicated **in red**. Demographic comparisons are from demographic data from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates and the 2020 Decennial Census for the Portland metropolitan region.

In total 332 participants responded to the optional the demographic questions. This is less than 20% response rate compared to the total 1,683 project rating responses received in the online public comment survey. The participants who opted-in shared 40 different zip codes as their residence as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Number of Responses by Zip Code




Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Table 1. Income (327 respondents)

Annual household income	Survey Percent	ACS 2016-2020
Less than \$10,000	1%	
\$10,000 to \$19,999	1%	5%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	1%	6%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	2%	7%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	3%	14%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	11%	17%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	16%	13%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	21%	19%
\$150,000 or more	26%	20%
Don't know/prefer not to answer	18%	--

Table 2. Gender (327 respondents)

Gender	Survey Percent**
Woman	51%
Man	38%
A gender not listed here	1%
Prefer not to answer	10%

** ACS 2016-2020 asks about sex, not gender

Table 3. Race/ethnic identity (326 respondents)

Racial or ethnic identity	Survey Percent*	2020 census
American Indian/Native American or Alaska Native	1%	3%
Asian or Asian American	6%	11%
Black or African American	3%	5%
Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin	6%	14%
Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander	1%	1%
White	76%	66%
An ethnicity not included above	2%	--
Prefer not to answer	13%	--

* Participants could select as many race/ethnicity identities as applicable. Therefore, the total is greater than 100%.

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Table 4. Age (329 respondents)


Age	Survey Percent*
18-24	2%
25-34	14%
35-44	25%
45-54	19%
55-64	12%
65-74	15%
75+	6%
Prefer not to answer	7%

Table 5. Disability (328 respondents)

	Survey Percent*
Yes	17%
No	72%
Prefer not to answer	11%

PROJECT APPLICATION PUBLIC COMMENT PROFILES

Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements | Washington County | \$6,640,700



The comments were mostly positive, emphasizing the community benefits of pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements.

“This link between Trimet, Waterhouse Trail and the alternative high school, as well as the developing areas west of 170th Ave, have generated more demand for active transportation in this area.”


“Merlo Station...has a lot of students who take transit, including young parents with their children. Anything we can do to make this road safer for them is a plus.”

Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0


Total number of project rating responses: 60

Average project rating: 4.6

Number of online survey written comments: 43



Beaverton Downtown Loop: Southwest Hall Boulevard – 3rd Street to 5th Street | Beaverton | \$4,649,687




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 65

Average project rating: 4.6

Number of online survey written comments: 37




Comments were mostly supportive. Commenters appreciated the safety, accessibility and economic benefits, with some concern over project cost and how to implement it.

“This starting project will help be a demonstration and a catalyst for what we can do to improve our downtowns into places that everyone can feel safe, not only those on cars.”

“I think this could be one of the most important, impactful projects on this list to demonstrate our regional shift away from prioritizing cars in our downtown areas. This could be an example of what's possible for others to follow.”

Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR-99 West | Sherwood | \$8,860,030




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 24

Average project rating: 4.3

Number of online survey written comments: 13



Comments were mostly positive, noting enhanced safety for pedestrians and cyclists. There is concern around the cost of the project.


“What makes THIS project GREAT is that it connects with two other off road trails, lengthening the opportunity for people to really get out and walk a good distance off road.”

“How does a walking path cost \$9m? Is that really good use of Tax Payer funds?”

“It will connect neighborhoods via now missing walking and biking paths and allow kids to take bikes to school.”

“Nice to have but more pressing problems to solve/alleviate.”

Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements | Washington County | \$5,252,300




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 1

Total number of project rating responses: 35

Average project rating: 4.1

Number of online survey written comments: 26




Comments were mostly positive, noting the need for improved transit infrastructure and improvements in public transit service. There were concerns about traffic and congestion for all modes.

“This would be great for folks along this corridor, which is dense for mostly single family homes with a good mix of retail and restaurants that are walkable on the path.”

“I grew up taking the bus to the Cedar Mill library, and I know first hand how much the delays can impact the bus lines there. I also think it's key that we maintain the neighborhood center feel of Cedar Mill...This solution of using tools within the space that we already have is the most sensible solution.

Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: Southeast Jennifer Street Multi-use Path |
Clackamas County | \$7,228,290




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 14

Average project rating: 3.14

Number of online survey written comments: 10




Comments were mixed with concerns of project prioritization and a lack of connectivity to the proposed infrastructure.

“I do think it has some merit in that it supports the Veterans' Village and Clackamas Village transitional housing. “

“There are many workers in the area who are forced to walk in the street with semis. This important connection will increase safety.”

“The county should focus its transportation funding on existing population centers...rather than directing resources toward unincorporated areas that encourage further sprawl. Prioritizing urban infrastructure benefits more residents and supports sustainable growth.”

Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction | Gladstone | \$8,721,932



Comments were mostly positive expressing excitement at the historic connection. Concerns were primarily related to project prioritization.

“I would appreciate this bridge as a local resident, but I'm not certain how necessary it is given that there is another bike/ped bridge a few blocks away.”

“This bridge would allow Gladstone residents to easily come and use them. It would make the area more connected and help to make individuals more healthy by increasing walking loop options. I do believe good walking loops would bring visitors from elsewhere in the metro area, and it would be a positive addition for all.”

“I see it as a missing link; I have walked and biked the trails nearby many times on both sides of the river, from Milwaukie to Oregon City and this would really be a valuable link.”

Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 51

Average project rating: 4.2

Number of online survey written comments: 35





Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Lakeview Boulevard - Jean Road to McEwan Road | Lake Oswego | \$983,000




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 12

Average project rating: 2.92

Number of online survey written comments: 7




Sentiment was mixed. The benefits of the project were acknowledged with concern about project prioritization.

“This is an important project for students getting to LO's largest new elementary school that does not have safe bike or walk areas.”

“This is a small street with an easily accessible parallel route. Traffic calming and shared facilities would be much better than expanding the roadway”

“Deliver a cycle track or a bike/ped trail adjacent to the project. Road widening by itself is a horrible waste of funds.”

North Dakota Street (FannoCreek) Bridge Replacement | Tigard | \$8,000,000




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 89

Average project rating: 4.8

Number of online survey written comments: 69




Comments are overwhelmingly supportive, emphasizing the heavy use of this narrow bridge. Safety for commuters for all modes was a theme.

“Replacement of this bridge is of utmost importance to continue to support appropriate efficiency of travel and appropriate traffic flow. If the bridge is not replaced, it will create traffic bottlenecks; over congestion in some parts of the city, and longer travel times for all. Please place high priority on this project to promote continued livability in our community.”

“The Fanno Creek trail is a major foot traffic arterial that crosses this road, near the bridge. The wetland, creek and Tualatin River will benefit greatly from an improved crossing, drainage and water management.”

Northeast 223rd Ave: Northeast Glisan to Northeast Marine Drive Safety Corridor Planning | Multnomah County | \$897,300




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 21

Number of online survey written comments: 12

Average project rating: 4.0




Comments were mostly supportive and overwhelmingly focused on safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.

“223rd desperately needs safety improvements with lack of sidewalks or adequate bike lanes in many areas. This road is primary access to both Blue Lake Park and Chinook Landing boat launch as well as the Marine Drive bike path.”

“I lead a group bike ride on this section monthly and it's the scariest part of our day. Wider bike lanes/shoulders, bike signage would help.”

“People are having to walk in the road! Please fund this project.”

Northeast Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access | Portland BOT | \$7,732,932



“NE Glisan St. is 30 mph. Do NOT put bicycle lanes on NE Glisan St. This portion of NE Glisan St. is used by freight semi- trucks to travel to I-205. It is a steep hill from NE 87th Ave. to NE 90th Ave.”

"I have clients and co-workers with visual impairments that live/work along this stretch of Glisan. Prioritizing this portion of Glisan would impact their ability to safely and independently travel along this stretch of Glisan."

“No one uses the existing bike infrastructure on Halsey, so continuing to waste money on additionally pointless ‘investments’ makes no sense.”


Total number of project rating responses: 110

Average project rating: 4.3

Number of online survey written comments: 87

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Northeast Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue | Gresham | \$9,420,793




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 16

Average project rating: 3.8

Number of online survey written comments: 9



Comment sentiment was mixed, the need for bicycle and pedestrian safety was affirmed, with concerns highlighting project prioritization and distance from town.

“This road desperately needs protection for bikes and pedestrians. Please fund this project.”

“This is a massive amount of money for a small amount of impact. There is not good connectivity in this area so what is the point of all this work?”


“This is a great project as this part of Halsey has needed improvements for quite a while. The proposed solution is a great fit for what is needed here.”

“I am so tired of seeing so much money spent on bike lanes that are not used.”

“Why sidewalks so far out from town, when there are lots of places with no sidewalks closer in?”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Northeast MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit | Portland BOT | \$4,879,517




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 93

Average project rating: 4.7

Number of online survey written comments: 59




The majority of comments were supportive. Comments frequently touched on the need for safer crossing and reduced vehicle speeds.

“I know this project came out of partnership with the Soul District and it has been long wanted by the Black community. Please fund this so it's easier to walk across MLK and access local businesses.”

“I live on a block right off MLK Jr. and often drive, bike, and walk down this corridor. With the proposed improvements, I would be much more inclined to walk and bike over choosing my car to go get food at the food carts, pick up my medication at the Walgreens, and even walk over to go volunteer at the Oregon Humane Society.”

Northeast Prescott Street: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access | Portland BOT
| \$7,577,698




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 89

Average project rating: 4.7

Number of online survey written comments: 73




The majority of comments were positive, emphasizing bicycle safety, traffic calming, connectivity and the need for sidewalk infill.

“The 82nd project has been through very extensive community engagement with formal groups and engaged community organizations and I think a lot of folks have been able to weigh in so these are well considered changes.”

“Prescott is one of the few ways for cyclists to cross 205, and one of only three that is not a High Crash Corridor. It’s the only way to traverse 205 north of Rocky Butte. It’s also one of the few ways for people to access Gateway Green. These upgrades will improve the safety of this route. If we’re serious about climate change we need to make it safer for everyone to traverse across 205”

Northwest Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdale Avenue | Gresham | \$4,067,496




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 18

Average project rating: 4.1

Number of online survey written comments: 7



Comment sentiment was mixed, with a focus on improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.


“Fully in support of sidewalks, completely against adding bike lanes. Division is a heavily travelled road and cyclists should be discouraged from traveling down this highly congested area.”

“Makes life safer for those outside of a car, makes our planet healthier, makes our communities more economically resilient.”

“This seems like an easy win. Let's help pedestrians and cyclists make their way down NW Division Street off the Fairview Trail. Very cool.”

“I ride the Fairview-Gresham trail occasionally. The utility of this improvement is not clear to me.”

OR-212/224 Sunrise Highway Phase 2: Bike/Pedestrian Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON) | Happy Valley | \$12,026,120




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 30

Average project rating: 3.13

Number of online survey written comments: 23



Comments were mixed in sentiment, with many concerns about prioritization and alignment with regional goals.

“The county should not be prioritizing transportation funding in unincorporated areas.”


“Very dangerous intersection that is car-centric...very helpful for the thousands of residents in the area. It's the only connection between the commercial area and the many neighborhoods to the south of the intersection”

“Please do not fund this project that is part of a larger freeway/expressway project that is contrary to so many regional policy goals”

“It’s regionally significant as it is the primary East-West route through northern Clackamas County. The people living in this community deserve to be safe and separated from commuter traffic.”

“More lanes for cars? No thank you.”

OR-99 East (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to tumwata village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development | Oregon City | \$3,832,341




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 36

Average project rating: 3.78

Number of online survey written comments: 29




Comments were mostly positive, noting safety, economic significance and benefit to tribes. There was some concern about impact on the environment.

“Could be a great draw for the community in addition to provide respectful and fitting integration for local tribes: i.e. Improved fishing access, tourism.”

“Oregon City 99E Enhancements and Trails is an interesting concept but it has not addressed the issues of a loss of a riverside forest or serious impacts to that forest. Oregon City has no riverside forest on the Willamette and this is the only heavily vegetated area that has emerged over the last 100 years. The forest is inhabited by American Bald Eagles and Osprey nests and numerous Great Horned Owl nests over its 2000 ft length area.”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements) | Portland BOT | \$4,416,999




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 45

Average project rating: 4

Number of online survey written comments: 32




Comments are mostly positive, the need for traffic management in order to enhance pedestrian safety and support transit is clear.

“Coupled with the Glisan through street, I think this will open up opportunity east of 205 and allow for more pedestrian traffic to move towards the greenlines and Mall 205.”

“I feel very concerned for my safety when walking, driving or biking around SE. There are many confusing intersections, and blind turns.”

“The Lents Town Center Monument is actually broken because cars keep hitting it. On SE Foster and SE 92nd, you can still see the crumbling building where a Tesla crashed into the building. Refuge Coffee House on SE Foster is missing a window because someone crashed into the building.”

Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue | Milwaukie | \$2,707,217




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 130

Average project rating: 4.7

Number of online survey written comments: 107




The majority of comments are supportive and enthusiastic about improving connectivity. Concerns were about further delaying traffic as well as the project cost.

“Right now getting to CCC's Harmony Campus and the N. Clackamas Aquatic Center is either dangerous or extremely meandering. These are important parts of our community that are currently really hard to access except via car! Adding a multiuse path will make a huge difference and make those spaces much more accessible”

“It is no secret that the intersection of Harmony, Linwood, and Railroad is extremely heavily used. The railroad crossing adds further delays for traffic. Adding the path would be unsafe and would add additional, unnecessary delays for motorists.”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Red Electric Trail East of Southwest Shattuck Road | Portland Parks | \$3,938,250




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 1

Total number of project rating responses: 181

Average project rating: 4.7

Number of online survey written comments: 163



The majority of comments are supportive with concerns coming from residents who live near the proposed trail or see downsides to greater access to schools and parks. There was general support for safety and accessibility, community connectivity and active transportation.


“My wife and I have enjoyed walking the trails in southwest Portland for decades. As she gradually becomes more disabled, however, we can no longer manage most of them. None are ADA-accessible, and the area does not have many sidewalks, so it’s hard to find a good place for us to stroll.

That’s what is so exciting about the Red Electric Trail. It will be ADA-compliant, run on relatively level terrain, and my wife will be able to walk along it with her walker. That makes it unique in this area.”

“Frankly, I don’t really want a ton of people having easier access to the unattended back side of our school grounds.”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

Smart Southwest 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project | Hillsboro | \$4,572,738




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 298

Average project rating: 4.5

Number of online survey written comments: 231




Comments were mostly positive, highlighting traffic congestion and safety and the effect of the MAX on traffic. There was mixed sentiment on using artificial intelligence (AI) in traffic management.

“Would love to see more integration of technology to help improve traffic flow around Hillsboro.”

“As Hillsboro continues to grow, we need to ensure all people in different modes of transit (car, bike, walking, bus, light rail, etc.) have safe and predictable ways to travel 185th.

“Build better infrastructure to support non-car-oriented travel, such as separated bike and ped paths. This intersection is a nightmare to cross on foot or bike. “AI” will not help with this.”

Southwest 175th Design: Southwest Condor Lane to Southwest Kemmer Road | Washington County | \$2,593,196




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 26

Average project rating: 3.4

Number of online survey written comments: 18



Comment sentiment was mixed. While the need for road improvements was a theme, many questioned whether the project would ultimately support active transit or achieve regional goals.


“Straight roads encourage people to drive fast. I'd prefer to leave this turn in there to force people drive slower.”

“This is a dangerous curve, especially with teens driving to MHS. However, I worry about speeds if the road is re-aligned.”

“This section of road and this intersection is dangerous, particularly at night. I am supportive of doing studies and coming up with alternative designs for this stretch.”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

West Burnside Green Loop Crossing | Portland BOT | \$7,677,446




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 94

Average project rating: 4.4

Number of online survey written comments: 68



Comments were mostly supportive, emphasizing the need for pedestrian and cyclist safety improvements and expressing excitement for the Green Loop.


“This project combines the many needs of the people who live and work near the park blocks (and will continue moving to these areas as they continue to grow) to help provide a better public space for everyone.”

“Because this project is between the very busy Burnside crossing intersections of both Old Town and the Pearl District, pedestrians are much more likely to be utilizing this area now and in the future.”

“Removing car traffic lanes in support of this project is a terrible idea.”

“Removing traffic lanes to add in bike lanes will ALWAYS be a good thing!!”

Westside Trail Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge Over Highway 26 | Tualatin Hills PRD | \$6,000,000




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 0

Total number of project rating responses: 115

Average project rating: 4.6


Number of online survey written comments: 87



Comments were overwhelmingly supportive, emphasizing the need for pedestrian and bicycle safety, especially for students and recreators.

“Sunset High School cross country and track runners (100+ students) run in this vicinity, their routes often taking them across the Murray Rd or Cornell Rd overpasses during rush hour traffic. Construction of this pedestrian bridge over Hwy 26 would create a much safer alternate route for these students. I'm certain the bridge would also be utilized by the greater community as biking, walking, and running our common activities throughout the trail systems north of Hwy 26.”

Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City | King City | \$7,841,343




Number of letter, email and voice mail comments: 1

Total number of project rating responses: 34

Average project rating: 4.2

Number of online survey written comments: 20



Comments were mixed in sentiment. There is excitement about the potential for extensive connectivity, with concern for local support and environmental impact.

“With the UGB recently expanded to the west side of this corridor and new urban development on the way, now is a perfect time to fund this project... In King City, it would be the only continuous active transportation route between Beef Bend Rd. and Tualatin River as 99W still has several serious gaps for pedestrians and cyclists.”

“I'm in favor of power line trails on principle and it would be great to be able to bike from Tualatin to Bethany someday but...this stretch of the river and the natural resources around it need to be protected.”

Exhibit C to Resolution 25-5511

If you picnic at Blue Lake or take your kids to the Oregon Zoo, enjoy symphonies at the Schnitz or auto shows at the convention center, put out your trash or drive your car – we’ve already crossed paths.

So, hello. We’re Metro – nice to meet you.

In a metropolitan area as big as Portland, we can do a lot of things better together. Join us to help the region prepare for a happy, healthy future.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

oregonmetro.gov/news

Follow oregonmetro



Metro Council President

Lynn Peterson

Metro Councilors

Ashton Simpson, District 1

Christine Lewis, District 2

Gerritt Rosenthal, District 3

Juan Carlos González, District 4

Mary Nolan, District 5

Duncan Hwang, District 6

Auditor

Brian Evans

600 NE Grand Ave. Portland,
OR 97232-2736
503-797-1700