Hi, Karen.

Having reviewed the packet for Thursday's Steering Committee meeting, I feel compelled, as a CTAC member, to submit the following comments:

Comments on proposed changes to TSP Policies:

- General comment: Kudos to staff on their recommendations regarding the proposed modifications overall. Thoughtful and thorough. I fully support staff recommendations. However, there are a some places where staff proposes possible alternative language, and I'd like to comment on a couple of those.

- Policy Page 10-11, Policy 36: While the alternative language proposed by staff is certainly better than the proposed change, I believe it is substantively inferior to the original, which should remain unchanged (your actual recommendation).

- Policy Page 12, Policy 42: There should be no change. Period.

I also have the following comments on proposed changes to TSP Goals:

- General comment: You have got to be kidding me! Why on earth would we be changing the goals now after creating the entire TSP based on those goals? These goals were iteratively run through the wringer of the Steering Committee, CTAC, staff, consultants, and the general public in excruciating detail, with considerable discussion going into the phrasing of each one to ensure that they reflected the collective vision of all of us and would provide a foundation for policies, projects, and programs that were right for Bend. They were voted on by the Steering Committee and adopted. Now you want a do-over? To revisit and modify them now is not only damaging to the entire process that got us to this point, but is an affront to all those who created, haggled, advocated, listened, compromised, and labored over each and every word. It is about as textbook an example of a violation of democratic principles as you can find.

  I can understand wanting to make clerical edits, or minor wording edits that provide clarity for what has already been adopted and are consistent with the previously accepted intent. However, the proposals in the packet are for substantive changes. If the Steering Committee is hell-bent on reopening these goals (please don't), here are my comments on a couple of the proposed changes. Lack of comment on any other proposed change denotes my outright rejection of that change.

- Goals Page 1, Goal 1, second bullet: I'm pretty sure I pointed this out long ago, but the abbreviation in the parenthetical is incorrect. It should be "(e.g., audible signals)" rather than "(i.e. audible signals)"

- Goals Page 2, Goal 2, second bullet: Why only crash data? Doesn't safety of users of the transportation system include, say, adverse health effects like air pollution or stressors? I'm sure there are other things that don't immediately come to mind, but as written, this

As a member of CTAC I want to stress the importance of the aspects of the plan which create programs and infrastructure not related to building or expanding roads. These activities cost far less than road construction, and offer the potential to have a major impact on both VMTs and SOV trips. I urge the Steering Committee to provide strong support for these aspects of the TSP and to find creative ways to fund them.

suggests that crash data, albeit important, is the only safety-related design criterion. Yes, "data driven" is important, but limiting it to one data category is inappropriate. Besides, it probably doesn't belong in a Goal, anyway.

- Goals Page 4, Goal 5, bullet 3: adding "by implementing technology and connectivity efficiencies" is not appropriate for a Goal. It describes how, not what, and there are other ways to reduce carbon emissions. The goal is to reduce transportation-caused carbon emissions. How to do that may belong in either Policy/Actions or Code.

Thanks.

Sid