gorge transit strategy

Working Group mEETING #2

# Meeting Summary

**Date/Time:** Tuesday, November 1, 2020 from 1:00-3:00 p.m.

**Location:** Zoom Meeting

## Attendees

**Participants:**

Jessica Metta, MCEDD

Amy Schlappi, Columbia Area Transit

Annick Chalier, Hood River County Energy Council Member

Armando Zelada, Bike/Ped Advocate and Event Organizer, Friends of the HCRH

Bill Bauman, Human Services Council

Brad Houghton, MCEDD

Britta Willson, Providence Hospital

Collen Coleman, City of Mosier

Dale McCabe, City of The Dalles, Engineer

Dale Robins, SW WA RTC

Dana Peck, Goldendale Chamber

David Duncan, Gray Line of Portland

Dustin Nelson, City of Hood River Planning Director

Eliot Rose, Metro

Emily Reed, Columbia Gorge Tourism Alliance

Eve Nilander, TriMet

Fred Kowell, Port of Hood River

Gordon Zimmerman, City of Cascade Locks

Jason Kelly, ODOT

Joel Madsen, Mid-Columbia Housing Authority

Jon Snyder, WA Governor’s Office, Outdoor Rec/Economic Development

Kathy Fitzpatrick, MCEDD

Kevin Gorman, Friends of the Columbia Gorge

Kevin Summa, WAGAP

Kristina Babcock, Transit Coordinator - Clackamas County

Leana Johnson, City of Stevenson

Lexi Stickel, PacificSource

Lisa Viles, ODHS – APD

Lynn Burditt, USFS

Maria Sipin, ODOT

Marta Cronin, CGCC

Matthew Cramer, WSDOT

Michael Kelly, Human Services Council

Patty Fink, Columbia Area Transit

Rajiv Batra, Hood River County resident and Planning Consultant

Renee Tkach, Friends of the Columbia Gorge

Scott Bricker, Travel Oregon

Seth English-Young, Federal Highway Admin

Sharon Carter, KCSS/MATS

Sophie Miller, Skamania County Senior Center/ Transit

Stanley Hinatsu, USFS

Terra Lingley, ODOT

Theresa Conley, ODOT

Valerie Egon, ODOT

**Meeting Presenters:**

**Kathy Fitzpatrick**, MCEDD

**Jessica Pickul**, Facilitator, JLA Public Involvement

**Nicole Metildi,** Online Meeting Coordinator,JLA Public Involvement

## Meeting Goals

1. Provide an overview of the transit strategy project and the goals for the working group meetings.
2. Confirm that the right plans and interests were examined with the Existing Services and Conditions assessment.
3. Gather feedback on the draft System Goals and Categories.

## Welcome and Meeting Overview

Jessica Pickul, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Kathy Fitzpatrick, MCDD, informed the group that the purpose of the meeting was to build on the high-level system goals that came out of the first Working Group meeting, as reviewed the purpose of the Working Group in general.

## Project Overview and Process

Kathy gave an overview of the project.

For a timeline overview, Kathy reminded the ***Working Group that this work falls within Phase 1, which should be completed by June 2021***. Right now, the project team is focused on doing foundational assessments (existing framework and gap, capacity, and opportunity analyses), to create a comprehensive vision and strategy. We are focusing a lot on creating partnerships. The first objective in Phase 1 is to answer the question: How do we work together as a region to build a robust transportation system?

Kathy provided an overview of the work done to date. The second objective in Phase 1 is largely done, which was to synthesize existing and ongoing transit planning efforts within the project area. The plans have been synthesized and summarized.

The next deliverable for this phase is to complete the gap and capacity analysis and then gather Working Group input. ***All the deliverables for this phase help develop a high-level regional vision.***

Kathy shared that the team is anticipating Phase 2 will start in July 2021. We are going to be working with the project Vision that comes out of Phase 1 use it as the basis for implantation strategies to realize the vision. The project team will be looking at data analysis, financial planning, policies and will seek out clear recommendations for how to get where we said we want to go.

Kathy pointed out who is in the room and the different types of organizations and people present. She emphasized the importance of recognizing the diversity of the groups represented, from tourism to health care to the US Forest Service. She reminded the group that ***the Working Group provides the regional Vision for the project***. Kathy also re-introduced the Project Management Team and gave an overview of the decision-making structure for the project. Ultimately, the MCEDD Board of Directors will consider the final Phase I Strategy document for adoption.

Kathy reviewed what was accomplished during the first Working Group Session. She informed the group that their feedback focused on regional challenges that needed to be addressed and that that feedback helped shape many of the Goal areas that will be discussed in this meeting. She also reviewed input from the Working Group from the survey.

Jessica asked if there were any questions from the group. There were no questions.

## Existing Framework: Existing Services and Plan Review

Kathy presented on the key takeaways included in the Existing Framework Memorandum. The memo includes existing services, how the local and regional plans were analyzed, and the goals and strategies from each of those plans. She emphasized that the important part of the work is integrating the Working Group input and using it to identify the goals they shared at the first Working Group meeting. The following are the highlights of that presentation:

* The strategy area is the area that falls within the jurisdiction boundaries of the five transportation providers, with the recognition that the transit services and connections are vital to region connectivity.
* Transportation providers have different organizational structures with different operational practices and funding needs.
* All providers offer Dial-a-Ride services, four provide fixed route services, with some of those providing deviated fixed route services. Some also offer shopping bus services.
* A map of the existing routes in the area was presented and Kathy brought up some of the impacts of COVID-19 and that the local transit services were a critical link to essential services for many residents.
* A map of proposed future routes was presented. Kathy emphasized these proposed services will provide greater connectivity and mobility between the regions and that if funding isn’t secured this year they will continue to seek funding.
* There is a proposal from Washington Department of Transportation that would connect Yakima county with Biggs County, which would then necessitate an extension of the the I-84 corridor service into Sherman County.
* The Existing Framework analysis included review of 21 local, regional, and state plans, and looked at strategies, goals, and policies for each one.
* The takeaway from that work was 1) plans are geographically isolated, 2) transportation is one of the region’s highest priorities and needs, and 3) the most common goals included coordination, system connectivity, system efficiency, and equitable access to community resources.
* The Working Group’s input on goals was organized into the categories. The existing plan goals/strategies that strongly support the Working Group Goals are identified in the Memo.

Jessica asked the group if there are any questions or plans that the framework might have missed. The following are the comments from the group.

* **Annick Chalier**: I’m a member of the Hood River County Energy Council. This is some great work. They applauded the team on the compilation of all of the information. Did you review the Hood River County Energy Plan? We have a whole section on transportation and land use, so it seems like it would be relevant.
	+ **Kathy**: Absolutely, we pulled in the Hood River County Energy Plan. It was foundational for our work.
* **Eliot Rose, Metro**: I was struck while reading the background memo by the amount of traffic that it highlighted coming to the Gorge from the Portland Metro area. Did you look at the TriMet service plan or Metro’s regional transportation plan for the potential to consider how those would support connections from the metro area to the Gorge?
	+ **Kathy**: Yes, some of those plans were reviewed. We have reached out to C-Tran, TriMet, and Metro because it is so incredibly important that there is coordination between these transportation providers and the other service providers outside of our jurisdiction. However, we do need to be cautious that we are not claiming to be planning for those Agencies. We appreciate your presence at this Working Group and know that these are the partnerships that will serve as a foundation for us being able to move forward with a regional Vision. Without those connections we don’t have the regional connectivity that we need. You’re right that there is an enormous number of people coming from the more urban areas into the Gorge. There are also many people coming from the Gorge into the urban area as well – for specialty services, for work, etc.
		- **Patty Fink, CAT**: Thanked Eliot for raising this issue, because it is also important to us, particularly as a funding issue. We have about 26,000 people who live here in all of Hood River County. Even if they all could pay $100 we still wouldn’t be able to fund the types of services we are looking at here. We believe that it’s critical to engage the Portland Metro area, and we’re disappointed that the decision was made not to include Multnomah County and the portions of Clark County that are part of the Gorge. We feel like one Gorge is one Gorge. The connections between Portland and the Gorge are critical - both in terms of the services provided and in how these services can continue to be funded, particularly as we address things like climate change, mature production, and other critical future issues.
		- **Theresa Conley, ODOT**: This question comes up more frequently as we gather information. This project was originally proposed and scoped to be more of the mid-Columbia transit strategy. Now, obviously, we’re thinking a little bigger, but are still somewhat hemmed in by the scope and capacity associated with that scope. I want to recognize that, but also that the connectivity is coming up as an important piece we need to note, and also carry forward to Phase 2.
		- **Armando Zelada**: I have a question about moving higher up the ladder to expand the scope. It seems like the Department of Agriculture, which controls the Columbia Scenic Area, should be at the table. Maybe the Governors’ offices, and perhaps climate issues should be at the table as well. It seems important to include all the players from the regional area. I am not sure I understand the limitations of the grant that was given to do this project versus the real goal of creating a regional transportation management plant.
		- **Kathy**: The governors’ representatives have been invited, as well as State Representatives. John Snyder from the Washington Governor’s office is here. Nate Stice from the Oregon Governor’s Office was also invited. There is a list of who has been invited on the Project’s website, and please let us know if you think anyone else is missing.
		- **Theresa**: Want to respond that this will not be lost moving forward. This is something for the PMT to dig more into, while recognizing the scope of this Phase 1 and while also recognizing there are other projects happening around the mountain that are happening concurrently. One of the things we are considering is how those will build together to add to the overall regional strategy.

## Strategy Goals: Breakout Discussion

Jessica introduced the goals for the breakout room discussion, which were review the draft categories and goals for the Gorge Transit Strategy and provide input on whether they meet the Vision the Working Group has for this process. Kathy added context for how the draft categories and goals were established.The Project Team review previous Working Group feedback, which resulted in 22 goals. The Project Team then categorized them and grouped based on what aligned together the most.

The draft goal categories are: Community vitality; Access/equity; Regional coordination; Environment/climate/resiliency; Financial sustainability; Built environment and connectivity; and Regional traffic management.

Jessica described the process for the breakout groups and explained that they are to discuss:

* *Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?*
* *Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?*
* *Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.*
* *Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?*

## Breakout Group Report Backs

Jessica asked each breakout group facilitator to share high level notes from their conversations. A full list of facilitator notes from the breakout rooms are included in **Appendix A**.

* **Group 1 Highlights**:
	+ They discussed the diverse communities throughout the Gorge and how to make sure our transportation system is going to work for them. There are some representatives from those communities that are missing from our group, so they noted to reach out to the community leaders and organizations that need to be present.
	+ No categories were missing.
	+ They mostly focused on goals that were missing:
		- More than **making transit feel safe** for our diverse communities, we need to focus on trust building and put investment in reaching out to these communities and doing needs assessments.
		- **Land use was missing** from a lot of the categories. How does land use support public transportation and vice versa? Denser land use and denser housing is an equity issue because future generations cannot afford to live here, and that is been happening for a few generations now.
		- **Housing is a big issue generally** – people are traveling further and further for their jobs. We are not going to have the workforce we need because their housing will be so far away.
		- Resiliency and responding to disasters goal **needs planning and coordination added**.
		- **No more parking lots** – how do we get the large groups of people from Portland on the bus? We need to disincentivize them getting into their cars, and so we need to stop building parking lots.
		- **Dustin Nilsen, City of Hood River**: Just adding that you can’t have a conversation about transit and transportation without having a conversation about land use. If you divorce the two it is a fatal flaw. There isn’t anything in the goal list that speaks specifically to housing. This is an overriding issue that is inherently impactful on the populations in all five of these counties. It is a paramount issue that needs to be addressed in all ways. This will have an impact on ridership and economic development. The vitality of our corporate citizens and their ability to continue to operate in this environment should be weighed and should have a positive impact on this conversation. This needs to be part of the infrastructure of this community, not an afterthought. This is community development, not just transit development.
* **Group 2 Highlights**:
	+ Group was less concerned about anything missing, but **worried there might be too much**.
	+ One thing that may be missing is if **rider viewpoint** is missing from the categories.
	+ They decided **community vitality, access/equity, and coordination are the core pieces** that then feed into the other goals.
	+ **Can community vitality and access/equity be merged** since there is so much overlap.
* **Group 3 Highlights**:
	+ The group agreed that **regional coordination was synonymous over all categories**. They **discussed that it is a project pillar**.
	+ There was no reference to any missing categories.
	+ They dug into financial sustainability.
	+ **Clarify what “sufficient ridership” means** because it is ambiguous. There could be some specific measurement that could become strategies.
	+ There is **no goal for operations**. There is nothing that speaks to maintenance as a part of safety, financial sustainability, etc. That might be a fatal flaw or a missing goal.
	+ Clarify the goals for access and equity. They felt there was a missing element related to **affordability as a part of access**.
	+ Availability and frequency of the service was talked about as important operational elements.
	+ **The first/last mile is part of access and equity**.
	+ **Coordination and traffic management could be combined**. The group discussed how they support each other and could be paired.
	+ There was some feedback about **the positive impact of** **universal fares**. It would be really beneficial to riders in the Gorge.
	+ A fatal flaw was discussed under **built environment**. The goal area **did not specifically state that it supports the environment, climate, or resiliency**. If we are going to look at supporting that topic area, we need to be calling out specific transit infrastructure that supports that, like charging stations, for example.
* **Group 4 Highlights**:
	+ Also talked about **combining equity and community vitality**.
	+ One category that jumped out was **age** – looking at transit and the built environment from an 8-80 perspective, looking at people’s varying mobility needs and what it takes to meet those needs from that perspective.
	+ Discussion around **safety and ending traffic violence**, which we connected to the idea of transit for all users and incorporating some Vision Zero goals.
	+ Built environment features, like planned uses, developing hubs came up since there’s some energy going into these efforts around Fairview. **Jobs, workforce development and access** are important and there is a need to be strategic about developing housing that supports the workforce and getting those co-benefits around transportation.
	+ The other goals from previous engagements still resonated – access and equity, coordination, those things.
	+ No fatal flaws, only a couple of Achilles heels: **not having enough funding to do all this work** and wanting to **make sure this work dovetails with the other work going on in the Gorge** so it is complementary to other regional efforts and would be supported by elected officials.
	+ **Eve, TriMet**: Added that they concur on the issue of land use.
* **Group 5 Highlights**:
	+ The **categories are a mix of outcomes and aspirations**. The group felt it was hard to see how they might all fit into an overall strategy.
	+ It seemed like there were a lot of goals. **If everything is a priority, nothing is**, and it might be useful to whittle the goals down and clarify them.
	+ **Some of the goals are a little vague**. They discussed the question “Is this a regional transit strategy or a regional transportation strategy?” It seems like **a lot of the goals are more general to transportation and not necessarily focused to transit**.
	+ We noticed housing was missing, which gets at the larger land use issue.
	+ **Connectivity is the most important goal**. The group talked about the concept of “Gorge-led and Portland-lifted.” Providing that connection for visitors from Portland and the Portland Metro area would also increase connectivity for Gorge residents. If we are creating a world class destination, it’s also raising it for the folks in the reason who depend on these services.
	+ **Access and equity are also important**. If we are providing access to recreation and access to the East Metro area where we have a lot of our communities of color and lower-income communities, enhancing service would lift all boats.
	+ No fatal flaws were discussed.
	+ **Patty**: I just wanted to make sure that we are clear on the difference between a strategy and a plan is. It would be helpful to clarify that language and what that means so we are clear on our terms. I want to make sure that people understand what we are trying to build here and not take on too much.
* **Group 6 Highlights**:
	+ There is a **lack of consistency in the goals across various categories**. Some lack action words, particularly the access and equity goals need to be more fleshed out.
	+ In general, the **access and equity category just needs more work**. The goal needs to have more specificity and they need to be measurable.
	+ Since this is a strategy, we want to be able to look at potential actions and measures we can take to meet the goals. As we create more specificity there will be room to define priority communities that gets into the **elderly, Indigenous and Native, and low-income communities**. **These populations weren’t listed, which we saw as a potentially fatal flaw**.
	+ Another fatal flaw was that there was no callout to the **linkages between the affordable housing, jobs, and transit**. This is economic development which was also not specifically called out, but which is infused into some of those categories. **Should economic development be its own category?**
	+ **This is a bi-state regional effort and that should be emphasized more**.
	+ Another goal that could be added under financial sustainability would be a reference to **continued investment in this kind of work we are doing right now**. Resources and leadership development that are needed to continue supporting these kinds of conversations and to maintain this work as we move forward.
* **Group 7 Highlights**:
	+ Land use came up as something that is missing. We agree with the recognition of **the linkage between land use and transportation.**
	+ **There are many goals** and that it will be a challenge to integrate them all as they are different in many ways.
	+ There may be a **challenge with the differences in jurisdictional missions and authorities**. This has been a challenge for other coordination plans in the region. When it gets down to making things happen sometimes those differing jurisdictions can create problems.
	+ There could be **more collaboration under the regional coordination category**.
	+ Under the financial category, **add a specific goal for having more funding in general**. The transit providers need money to operate, let alone meet the goals that have been outlined here.
	+ **Bike and pedestrian facilities are really important**. A hurdle in some of our communities is even being able to get to transit.
	+ Some of the goals seem to go underneath each other instead of all being on the same level. It seems like some could be achieved once others have been met.
	+ Each community has its differences. These goals are intended for a regional level, but even within the Counties, the communities are very different and might have different priorities.

Jessica Pickul wrapped up the discussion by discussing the key themes the groups named.

* **Theresa**: One of the things that stood out to me is the way community vitality and natural resources are very intertwined for this community. There is a lot of identification with the scenic area, which may not even be the scope of this project. It feels important.
* **Brad Houghton, MCEDD**: I wanted to highlight the idea from Group 3 of defining what our pillars are – what holds our roof up? And from Group 5, they talked about the goals look like outcomes or aspirations. It will be helpful to define that and narrow in on things more as we continue this.

## Wrap Up and Next Steps

Kathy thanked everyone for attending and discussed what is coming next. A survey will be sent to the Working Group to gather more feedback and dig in deeper into what was discussed at this meeting. The Gap and Capacity Analysis Memo is in development right now and the group will discuss that in January. All the input from the Working Group will be consolidated and used in Working Group Session 3, scheduled for January.

Jessica thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

## Appendix A: Breakout Room Facilitator Notes

The following are the unedited facilitator notes from each of the breakout rooms.

### Group 1:

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* No missing categories.
* Not much comment on whether these are the right categories. Some of the goals could be moved under several categories.

**Goals that should be added to Access/Equity**

* Engaging the BIPOC community.  Needs Assessments, Travel Training, eliminating barriers of language, culture, disability.
* Engaging these communities thoughtfully, with community leaders and community based organizations, not white people from Portland.
* Build more trust with these diverse communities.  Build the infrastructure they need to access transit.
* Engage these communities in these conversations and give them leadership roles in the project.
* For example, reach out to Radio Tierra (Ubaldo Hernandez, Juan Reyes)
* Expand definition of equity to serve those of all ages and physical/developmental abilities.  Include travel training programs to remove barriers.  Some people also need travel assistants.
* Fear of using the transit system is a huge barrier to everyone.  Work on reducing fear and making transit easy to everyone.

**Add Land Use** to multiple categories:  Equity, Community Vitality, Environmental

* Land use choices need to be planned to support transit.  Workforce mobility between home and work stretching further and further.  Finally there won't be any workers because they can't afford to live anywhere nearby.  Vertically develop communities so that generations can continue to live in the Gorge (community continuity).  Younger generations have to leave because housing not available or affordable.  This is an equity and a community vitality and an environmental issue.

**Goal:**  Balance cost of services with equitable access.  Keep prices low for low-income folks.  Don't price people out of the access (transit fees, parking fees).

**Congestion:**

* The Gorge suddenly has a region-wide congestion problem.
* Create disincentives for people from metro areas to come to the Gorge in their SOVs.
* Charge for parking.
* Don't build more parking lots!!
* Use transit to move people.  Get them out of their cars.

**Built Environment and Access**:  must all be ADA.  But not just concrete--need to build programs for the blind and others who need more support to use transit.

**Add Economic Development** to Community Vitality. Transit will support workforce mobility and make community resources available to all.  Transit is important to the vitality of our businesses.

This is Community Development, not just transit development!

**Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?**

### Group 2

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* Too many categories? The categories can be ranked / tiered to show relative priority. Or on what is a foundational need ranging through to what is more aspirational or less directly tied to transit.
* Would not add any but potentially consolidate Access & Equity with Community Vitality. There is a lot of overlap, even just looking at the verbiage. And equity/access are integral to community vitality.
* Simplify / make strategic statements for the higher level goals
* There are two diametrically opposite goal areas: Access (for residents to get to healthcare, work, education, etc) and Recreation (for those who don’t live in the Gorge but are visiting)
* Is the Environment / Climate goal more of a RESULT of public transit rather than a goal in and of itself?
* Should the Enviro/Climate/Resiliency related to resiliency be rolled under Community Vitality (and give a little less stature, in part because Resiliency Plans do not lie solely with Transit but more at the County level) This also points to the strong overlap of natural enviro protection & community vitality… what that means to Gorge residents & stakeholders. Also, as we look at separating out this category, traffic mgmt. can lead to protection of natural resources.
* There is also overlap between Regional Coordination & Financial Sustainability but Regional Coordination is so critical is should be kept separate

**Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?**

* Do not add any goals. The goals are right but should be tiered or presented in a way which shows the most important core goal areas and how some of the others may RESULT FROM or BUILD On the core goal areas. And the Coordination is what glues it all together.
* Should include rider experience within the objectives/bullet points. This can point toward regional coordination around e-fare, marketing, standardization, seamless rides
* Better define the ‘system efficiency’ objective under Financial Sustainability – should this be under Regional Coordination instead?
* A few visuals from my group (I think we were all very visually oriented thinkers!)

Regional Traffic Mgmt Regional Coord Built Enviro Financial Sustainability

Env/Climate/Resiliency + Community Vitality & Access

*Maslow’s Hierarchy Approach – Core at the bottom with resulting benefits or lessor needs as we move up the triangle*

Enviro

Community Vitality

Traffic

Built Enviro

**Access & Financial Sustainability**

**Regional Coordination**

**CORE BENEFITS / MUSTS**

Community Vitality

Access & Equity

Financial Sust.

**HOW TO GET THERE**

Regional Coordination

Built Environment

**BYPRODUCTS**

Traffic mgmt.

Resiliency

Climate/Enviro

**Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.**

* Community Vitality, Equity & Access, Regional Coordination, Financial Sustainability
* **Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?**

### Group 3



### Group 4

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* Access Equity and Community Vitality should be added together
* 8 -80 Communities should its own category
	+ Children to older adults
		- Mobility needs and trip types can be age specific
	+ There are significant barriers for mobility from an ADA perspective
		- Built environment specifically
		- Barrier for anyone slower than 40MPH crossing the street
	+ Veterans
	+ One participant (Britta) is working on the Gorge becoming an “Age Friendly Community”
		- WHO
		- AARP
* Workforce should be more forceful
	+ Access to employment
		- Lack of transit major barrier to employment
* Safety should be more forceful
	+ Reduce traffic violence
	+ There are known challenge points like Multnomah Falls
		- Traffic blocking emergency medical services
	+ West end of Hood River dangerous for nonmotorists
* Call more attention to Regional Coordination in the sense of having the authority to implement a “unified system”
	+ All agencies as one

**Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?**

* The goal of safety could be present in multiple categories
	+ Built environment and connectivity
	+ Regional Traffic Management
* Safety should be more forceful
	+ Regional Traffic Management
		- Ending traffic violence (i.e. Vision Zero) (missing)
* Built Environment and Land Use:
	+ Developing Transit Hubs (missing)
		- Fairview has potential
* Regional Coordination
	+ Transit Hubs (missing)
	+ Unified fare system should be it’s own bullet (separate from between transit providers)
* Community Vitality:
	+ Historical preservation or preservation of character (missing)
		- Preventing spawl, protecting culture of the town/compact
* Built Environment and Connectivity
	+ Transit Supportive Land Uses (missing)
* Regional Coordination
	+ Transit Supportive Land Uses (missing)
* Workforce more forceful (missing)
* Access to groceries and basic needs could be more distinguished
* Could “crosswalk” natural overlap of goals between categories

**Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.**

* Providence: access to healthcare – older adults accessing medical appointments Hood River to Dallas or Hood River to Portland
* City of Stevenson: Regional Traffic Management HW 14 (e.g. dog mountain shuttle); Regional Coordination – Oregon has more resources to connect with in the Hood River area; Access and Equity (specifically jobs, ~60 percent of residents of Skamania County must leave the county to access employment opportunities.
* Trimet: Regional coordination, Built environment, Regional Traffic management
* Climate Goals are integral/foundational with the other elements/goals
* This is also a nexus between Land Use/Built Environment and Climate
* **Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?**
* Funding is an “Achilles Heel” (not a fatal flaw but “drags down” transit expansion scenario)
	+ - Washington Park Shuttle – paid with parking revenues
* Ensure alignment with how these goals interface with other initiative in the Gorge
	+ Broader than transportation
	+ Especially from an elected official perspective
		- Transit provider are governed by elected, so there is a sensitivity to systemic needs
* Tension or tradeoffs
	+ Ridership vs. coverage vs. reaching vulnerable populations
	+ Equity vs. efficiency
		- Washington State (Klickitat County) is focus on human services transportation
		- CAT is focusing in ridership
	+ Arriving at co-benefits

**Other Comments**

* Bridges should be multimodal
* Affordable Housing
	+ Transit supportive built environment
	+ Community Vitality
	+ Workforce housing in transit rich areas
	+ Less expensive housing is often away from transit

### Group 5

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* They are a mix of outcomes/output/themes
* Regional traffic management – needs to be more specific to transit, include both network and providers.
* Is this a plan or a strategy? Need to clarify
* It might be useful to whittle down the goals and clarify what some of the broader ones mean.

**Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?**

* Are these goals for a regional transportation strategy or a transit strategy. Right now they are more consistent with a regional transportation strategy since they are not specific to transit. Some of these goals are not necessarily under the control of transit agencies.
* Housing as a goal isn’t included.
* Regional coordination is key – the bike/ped connections, infrastructure, etc. is important.

**Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.**

* Connectivity for people to explore/enjoy/support the Gorge. Intra-regional connectivity is important. If we’re creating a world-class experience, we need to elevate and enhance transit opportunities.
* The critical piece is creating connections to the Portland region and the airport – visitors to the Gorge need to consider transit before hopping in their car to come out.
* Engaging the Portland region allows transit providers to include and enhance service to local communities.
* Basic infrastructure access/equity is the most important goal. If we can crack the nut of providing transit to recreation sites, including the east Portland metro area, we’ll serve historically marginalized communities and low-income residents. Transit access to recreation and services is interlinked.
* **Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?**
* Need to clarify the parking issues goal (though the goal itself is not a fatal flaw) – are we encouraging increased parking, or are we managing/charging to fund transit?
* Not sure if we need the response to disaster goals – are we talking about an interconnected system and creating resiliency within a network?
* There are a lot of goals (too many?) This diminishes the importance of what you’re really trying to achieve. If you have to remove a category, take out the Environmental/Climate/Resiliency, not because they aren’t important, just because they seem more ancillary to what we’re trying to accomplish.
* There are things listed as goals that don’t work towards furthering the strategy, and also are there key issues outside of the strategy that we’ll need to focus on?
* Replace parking needs and issues with “manage existing parking capacity” to clarify that goal.
* Prioritize the existing goals - there are too many to be effective on this list.

### Group 6

* In general there is lack of consistency in the goals, some lack action such as the Access/Equity goals (and in general that category needs to be fleshed out). The goals need to be specific and measurable.
* As we create specificity under the goals, maybe there is room to define priority communities. That gets into elderly, indigenous and native communities, low income, etc.
* Equity is more than diversity in community. How are we leveling the playing field? What are we doing for lower income households? Lets make the equity goals more specific?
* The Regional Coordination goals as stated are too vague, and the sole mention of a Universal Pass does a disservice to the many other ways agencies/organizations need to coordinate. How do we define regional coordination? This needs to be expanded on.
* There is not a specific call out to the link between affordable housing, jobs, transit.
* Economic Development is not mentioned. It is infused in some of the categories, group was unsure as to whether it should be its own category or separate goal, or incorporated with an existing goals. Could be a goal within Community Vitality or the Community Vitality category could be renamed (maybe “Community Vitality and Economic Development”)
* Within the goals we need to remember that this is a bi-state regional effort, this should be emphasized.
* Under financially sustainability: suggestion to add continued investment in the work, resources, and leadership development that are needed to continue supporting convenings (like this visioning project) and continue to move forward in work/programs/projects that address climate and equity.
* Built environment: When we think of built environment and connectivity, need to specifically call out affordable housing communities.

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* Renee/Friends – this does a great job in capturing the categories. Sophie agreed in chat.
* Later addition in conversation: Economic Development is not mentioned in categories or goals. It is implied in some categories, but should be called out specifically. Should it be a category or goal?
* Joel: (in reference to Built Environment category): when we think of built environment and connectivity, we need to specifically call out affordable housing communities.

**Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?**

* Maria/ODOT: Access and Equity, and some other categories, need action words.
* In general: the goals need to be more specific, use action words, be measurable. They should be reframed to have a consistent format in all categories.
* Sophie: The Regional Coordination goals as stated do not really get into the meat of coordination and the sole mention of a Universal Pass does a disservice to the many other ways agencies/organizations need to coordinate. This needs to be expanded on. How do we define regional coordination?

**Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.**

* Maria Sipin/ODOT: since bike/ped infrastructure is a goal mentioned under Built Environment, the goal should be more specific about filling in network gaps: connections with trails, sidewalks. This is coming from the perspective of implementing projects under ODOT’s plans.
* Joel Madsen/Mid-Columbia Housing authority: need to highlight the link between affordable housing, jobs, and transit.
* Seth/WFL: from the perspective of access to federal lands, it’s not just about recreation but there is also an economic development component.
* Renee/Friends: Access to trails is important (under built environment) for Friends, congestion management is also important.
* Sophie/Skamania Co Senior Sevices: Number one issue for transit agencies/operators is financial sustainability. Without it they cannot sustain existing services nor increase service/offer new services.
* Maria – ODOT is trying to be more careful and aware of integrating indigenous/native communities needs and priorities in Clackamas County projects, which could be relayed into this Gorge work. trying A lot of fits into climate and resiliency, community vitality.
* Maria’s suggestion: What are the priority communities this strategy/vision is aiming to serve? BIPOC, indigenous, elderly?
* Seth: WFL often groups this is under “cultural resources”
* Maria: As we create specificity under the goals, maybe there is room to define priority communities
* Seth: When he thinks of natural resources and cultural resources he is thinking of places, Maria is thinking of people.
* Joel: How are we engaging with Native Americans? Are there folks in the working groups representing these communities? If no, should there be?
* **Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision.**
* Economic Development is not specified.
* Joel – question: Within the goals we need to remember that this is a bi-state regional effort, this should be emphasized.

### Group 7

**Are there any missing categories? Are these the right categories?**

* Rajiv: Recognition of linkage between land use and transportation is missing
* Stan: There are many goals, will be a challenge to integrate all because they are different in some ways. Different jurisdictional missions and authorities could also be a challenge.
* Brad: geographically isolated planning is a challenge.

**Are there missing goals? Are these the right goals?**

* Brad: add more elaboration under the regional coordination category
* Stan: suggest changing the language of this Community Vitality Goal to the following: “Enhance residents, visitor, and recreation experience.
* Sharon: Financial goals are missing one that just says the need for funding in general. We just need more money to operate, let along meet greenhouse gas goals for example. So many plans, but no resources to implement them.

**Is there a goal that is especially important to consider for you or your agency/community? Why? Give us details that bring these goals to life.**

* Sharon: the financial goal noted above would be a priority for MATS.
* Brad: Regional coordination is a priority goal because other goals would nest in it
* Rajiv: it is not clear how we would define success. And communities are different.
* Dale: a priority would be bike and ped facilities so people can get to transit.
* Stan: Transit as a part of the visitor experience and safety would be priorities.
* **Fatal Flaw: Is there a goal or category that you absolutely don’t want to include as part of a collective regional transit system vision?**
* Brad: the environmental goals are derivative if you achieve the other goals. Maybe they are a sub-goal? Stan: Maybe equity also.
* Stan: yellow flag is the authorities and jurisdictions issue mentioned before. Can be a barrier.
* Sharon: There are so many goals listed and they are all important. Different communities have different priorities in goals, even just between East and West Klickitat County there would be different priorities of these goals.

## Appendix 2: Chat Transcript

The following are the unedited comments from the chat box from the meeting.

* From Lynn - USFS CRGNSA to Everyone: 01:28 PM - YAY
* From Leana, City of Stevenson to Everyone: 01:28 PM - WooHoo!
* From Renee, Friends of the Columbia Gorge to Everyone: 01:28 PM - Fantastic work!!!!!!!!!!!!
* From Sophie Miller Skamania Co Senior Services to Everyone: 01:29 PM - Well, I applied. Hasn't been approved just yet. :)
* From Lynn - USFS CRGNSA to Everyone: 01:29 PM - at least the possibility exists. thanks for all you do Sophie
* From Eve, TriMet to Everyone: 01:37 PM - I was about to say that, Eliot. Thanks!
* From Jon Snyder to Everyone: 01:43 PM - WA Governor's office is here.
* From PattyFink to Everyone: 02:32 PM - Thanks Dustin - Land Use is huge.