

To: Sam Haffner, Governor's Transportation Vision Panel Project Manager

From: 1000 Friends of Oregon, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, Oregon Environmental Council, OPAL Environmental Justice, Oregon Walks, Transportation for Oregon's Future, Upstream Public Health

Re: [Draft Outline of Transportation Innovation Subcommittee Findings](#)

Date: March 2, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the work of the Innovation and Seismic Subcommittee of the Governor's Transportation Vision Panel. The Draft Outline of Transportation Innovation Subcommittee Findings is generally quite good, but we have a couple of questions and suggestions.

- (1) As defined by this subcommittee, "innovation" seems to be limited to technology alone. Did the subcommittee consider other innovations, such as bike share programs, transforming streets into pedestrian walkways (which creates tourist attractions and boosts traffic to stores in the area), and making transit free (which leads to greatly increased ridership and reduces congestion on the road far more cheaply than adding new lane miles)?
- (2) We suggest that the state and local governments make sure to look at the unintended consequences of transportation innovations and consider them against investments in affordable and proven approaches to the same challenges. As one example, there are still a number of questions about driverless cars. Some of the potential pluses and minuses are described in the article [Driverless Cars and Transport: A Debate](#) in the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy's publication *Sustainable Transport*. Another example is transportation network companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft. These ride-sourcing companies are an important new component of our transportation ecosystem, but well-constructed regulations will be important to ensure equitable wages, among other things, as well as monitoring whether TNCs are contributing to reductions in vehicle miles traveled. Are TNCs helping people leave their own cars at home or even ditch their cars? Or are they competing with public transit, substituting for walking and biking trips, or even adding more cars to the road? A [study by NRDC](#) is now underway to look at this. In addition, model policies could be developed to help local agencies better negotiate with TNCs to meet paratransit needs more affordably and effectively, serve first/last-mile transit connections, and provide data. By the way, in Sao Paulo, the city is considering auctioning credits to TNCs that permit them to drive a certain number of miles over two months, and if they exceed their allotment they pay a surcharge.
- (3) Other technology-oriented innovations to consider include:
 - A single integrated app that not only allows a user to pay for all forms of public transit in a city but also allows the user to access taxis and transportation network companies, bike share bikes, walking directions and more.

- Better data about people movement could make it easier to site bike-share docks, or re-route buses to fit travel patterns, or add an extra train during rush hour to meet demand.
 - In general, in the field of providing traveler information, the public sector's role should be to make data available so that private sector entities can create apps that meet consumers' needs on various transportation options.
- (4) Another major consideration for policy makers is how to ensure transportation innovations reach poor and vulnerable Oregonians, those who are disproportionately impacted by policies that primarily benefit people who can afford cars. For example, self-driving cars will be quite expensive, out of the reach of low-income and likely middle-income Oregonians. Every dollar spent on one innovation means a dollar not spent on another: should we be focused on self-driving cars or technologically advanced innovations that can be accessed by all?
- (5) We are very supportive of EV advancements, including charging infrastructure across Oregon. EVs and other clean fuel technologies have become even more important as oil has steadily become dirtier: the pollution associated with extracting and refining a barrel of oil has increased by nearly a third over the last decade. EVs reduce our dependence on oil, produce far less global warming pollution than their conventional counterparts, produce no air pollution at the tailpipe, and are cheaper to drive. To ensure EVs are deployed broadly and benefit lower-income households, Oregon should consider the Charge Ahead California Initiative, which is working to put 1 million electric vehicles on California's roads by 2023 and broaden access to electric vehicles through innovative car sharing programs, financing programs for low-income Californians, and vehicle retirement and replacement incentives.

If you have questions about our comments, please contact Chris Hagerbaumer, Oregon Environmental Council Deputy Director, at chrish@oeconline.org or 503-222-1963 x102.