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## Abstract

With increased competition for transportation dollars, it is more important than ever to provide citizens with the skills and knowledge to effectively participate in transportation decisions affecting their neighborhoods. For more than ten years, the City of Portland and Portland State University have teamed up to offer a class intended to help city residents become more effective advocates on local transportation issues. The course, designed for the neighborhood activist, is facilitated by a transportation planning consultant. A series of guest speakers that includes policy- and decision-makers, planners and engineers from the city and regional governments, and the regional transit agency, provide insight on how to negotiate the maze of traffic and transportation issues and agencies. This project is intended produce a course curriculum and implementation handbook to provide transportation education and leadership skills to community residents, activists and leaders. It will first document the effectiveness of the existing course by conducting a case study of the course over time and use that information to provide a blueprint for other communities to replicate the course for their local citizenry. The study will examine the underlying motivations for the course, content, delivery methods and outcomes, including knowledge and skills gained and used by past participants. The project also will identify and assess the current gaps in citizen knowledge and skills that could be incorporated into future courses. A secondary objective of this project is to identify other populations, especially for those typically under-represented in traditional transportation planning processes, who could benefit from such a course and to make recommendations for course content and delivery method. This project will be an updated model course curriculum and handbook for implementation that can be used in cities across the country, with special attention to traditionally underserved populations. The intended outcome is to provide a way to impart knowledge and skills to local residents and activists so they may become more informed and active leaders in their local transportation planning efforts.
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1.0 ABOUT THE PORTLAND TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COURSE

The Portland Traffic and Transportation course serves a number of different purposes. On one hand, it is designed to develop citizens who are informed about the transportation system, including how it got where it is today, what agencies and actors play a role in its operation and development, and how they, as citizens, play a role in its future. In this sense, there is a goal of broadening and deepening the existing knowledge about the system among the general population. On the other hand, there is an implicit goal of encouraging participation in the system with the understanding that doing so is in some way good for advancing a transportation system that works for citizens of the city. People may not consider themselves advocates, but if they are concerned about a certain issue, know how decisions get made around that issue and how to be involved in the decision-making process, they are more likely to be effective in advocating for the change they wish to see.

In order to better understand the origin and motivation of the Portland Traffic and Transportation course, I met with several key figures in the course’s history, including Congressman Earl Blumenauer, the Portland city commissioner in charge of Public Works, including the Department of Transportation, in the late 1980s and early 1990s. I also met with Rick Gustafson, the longtime course instructor. The two provided valuable insight into the motivation of having the course, along with its original and ongoing goals.

The earliest seeds of the Portland Traffic and Transportation course may date back to 1975, when the Ford Foundation sponsored a retreat with leaders of the City of Portland, Multnomah County and Portland State University (PSU) to explore the potential for connections between PSU, the city and the county in furthering the development of PSU as the urban university in Portland. Gustafson, at the time an Assistant to the Vice President of Public Affairs for PSU, coordinated the retreat. One key takeaway from that retreat was the acknowledgement that some of the best intellectual talent in Portland was employed by the city and county, and should be tapped to engage as adjunct professors at the university. In 1987, when Congressman Blumenauer first called for a traffic and transportation class to be taught in Portland, Gustafson brought him a suggestion based on the retreat idea of tapping talent in local transportation agencies. The course took a few more years to get off the ground, and was first taught in the fall of 1991. It was taught twice a year until 2008, and once a year since that time. Over those 24 years, an estimated 1,200 or more Portland residents have taken the course.
1.1 GOALS AND MOTIVATION FOR THE COURSE

Understand the complexities of the transportation system: Congressman Blumenauer explained how, as the Portland Commissioner of Public Works, daily interactions convinced him that just about everyone cared about transportation, but he regularly encountered people with misconceptions about how transportation worked in Portland. People would generalize from their own experience, but often their opinions were not fact based. Part of the problem, Blumenauer observed, was that transportation is a complicated and technical issue, and that people had to first understand many of the intricacies and layers of the system in order to understand how the whole system functions. For example, people may feel that increased speed limits of 50, 60 or 70 miles per hour would serve the cause of fighting congestion; however, an empirical analysis might show that such speeds actually reduce the number of cars that can get through, while traffic would flow better at 32mph. As part of broader initiative to educate and engage the public, there was a need to invest in citizen infrastructure and technical understanding of transportation systems.

Humanize/demystify the work of the government agencies: Congressman Blumenauer observed that one problem with interactions between citizens and government agency staff is that such interactions often take place under contentious and oppositional circumstances. However, the course offered an opportunity to have transportation professionals engaging with citizens in a neutral setting. Gustafson also explained that an important goal of the course is for citizens to gain an understanding of transportation agencies and respect for the people in the agency.

Enhance the value of many informed people in a community: A long-term goal of the course, and one that has been realized in some ways due to the many years the course has been operating, is to develop a wealth of citizens informed about transportation throughout Portland. Congressman Blumenauer, pointing to the over 1,200 cumulative graduates of the course, related how, when he goes to transportation meetings, he’ll ask people to raise their hand if they had attended the Portland Traffic and Transportation course – it’s not uncommon for a quarter of the hands to go up. Although harder to quantify, the Congressman believes the class is directly related to Portland’s history of being able to engage in sophisticated discussions and undertake balanced transportation and development solutions.

Foster community engagement in developing solutions: One of the benefits of the course is that there are many highly competent people with great wealth of experience – a sort of untapped wealth of civic capacity that may just need a spark to get going. Congressman Blumenauer points out that this type of course gives them an opportunity to learn about the transportation system and how to make an impact. He has continually been impressed by what participants bring to the class, including veterans of neighborhood politics, professionals in transportation and development, and advocacy. Regardless of their past experiences, many student projects figured out problems (and often with fixes made with relatively modest cost) that agencies had not been able to figure out, either due to lack of resources, local knowledge, bandwidth or other factors.

“Share” top intellectual talent with citizens: As mentioned above, many of the top minds in the city, particularly on transportation topics, work in local transportation agencies. The course offers a prime opportunity to share their knowledge and experience with local citizens.
Connect the university to the city: The course was viewed as an important way to bring some of the benefits of having an urban university to the people of Portland, even if they were not enrolled in the university. Further, the course offered current students the benefits discussed above, including access to top transportation leaders.

1.2 COURSE PRINCIPLES, EXPECTATIONS, ELEMENTS

Longtime course instructor Rick Gustafson outlined core requirements of the course and key takeaways he expected students to leave with.

Key course elements:
1) Lecture series with good speakers
2) Tour of the city – practical visual impact of transportation
3) Problem-solving assignment that uses lectures to think through a problem

Key takeaways for students: Gustafson explained what he views as the key knowledge, experience and skills that students take away from the transportation course. Among the key components are:
1) Knowledge about the transportation system’s history and development
2) The language of the transportation discipline needed to effectively communicate with city agencies and staff (helpful both in giving and receiving/understanding information)
3) Knowledge of the key players in the city’s transportation decision-making, which humanizes the process for them
4) Knowledge about how to be effective in advocating for something in the transportation system
5) Confidence to communicate effectively at the public level

Understand how to navigate city agencies (and not give up): Gustafson explained that an important outcome of the class is to learn about how interactions with the city work, which in part requires participants to get out of their comfort zone and feel out how to address a problem. He cited a course assignment task to call someone at the city about their problem. No advice is given on who to contact or what number to call – the student must navigate on their own. One of the learning opportunities occurred when students reported back to the class on the sort of responses they got, who they got shuffled off to, and what kind of answers were given. The discussion usually led to a teachable moment about how students must be tenacious in seeking out answers. If they ask the city for something and are told “no,” they couldn’t take that as a final answer. Gustafson stated that he tries to teach students to be told “no” at least three times.

Need for commitment from city leadership: Among the operating principles of the class are that top leadership in city transportation participates. This gives participants access to the people making the decisions, along with top expertise in engineering and the best information on the city’s process. This requires, among other things, a champion of the course who can get the top transportation, planning and transit professionals to “buy in” to the class. Both Gustafson and Blumiauer noted that the agency staff and leadership have wanted to figure out how to engage and work with citizens, and welcomed the opportunity to discuss planning and engineering problems with them. Another key requirement is that the city recognize the value
of an informed citizenry, and make a commitment to elevating the knowledge base in the community.

Congressman Blumenauer stressed the importance of the course becoming institutionalized within local agencies and institutions, as he believes it has been in Portland. He emphasized that numerous transportation commissioners have retained the course over the years, and that there would be an outcry in the city if the course disappeared. He also believes that, with the curriculum that’s been developed and the guest lecture format, they would be able to find a number of enthusiastic and qualified Portlanders who could step in and run the class.

1.3 COURSE PROMOTION ON THE CITY OF PORTLAND WEBSITE

The Portland Traffic and Transportation course is advertised on the Portland Bureau of Transportation website as a class that is “designed for the neighborhood activist, new or experienced, who wants to make a difference in traffic and transportation issues in Portland.” The site makes a point to note the degree to which the class focuses on brass tacks and how the average citizen can be involved in transportation decision-making. Specifically, the website advertises that participants will learn about “local traffic and transportation issues, transportation options, and how to get things done in your neighborhood.” It notes that past participants have “learned how to negotiate the maze of traffic and transportation agencies and issues,” and that the course is an opportunity to “hear about how you can make a difference even in these times of budget cuts and shrinking gas tax revenue.”

Topics to be covered in the course are listed as:

- Traffic Management Techniques: Speed bumps, traffic circles and "traffic calming."
- Regional Transportation Planning: How do traffic decisions in other areas affect us?
- Environment: The urban landscape, street design, air quality - what quality of life do we want?
- Alternative Transportation Modes: Pedestrians, bicyclists and transit - can we share the road?
- Transportation Finance and Policy: How to get your issue on the policymakers' agendas.

1.4 ENROLLMENT AND COST

The course is available to residents for free, upon completion of a scholarship form, which asks why they are interested in taking the course and if they can commit to attending all 10 course sessions. Students may also take the course for one PSU credit, but must register and pay through the university to do so. Currently, only undergraduate credit is available for this course at PSU.

---

1.5 CLASS SESSIONS

The following is the syllabus from the fall 2013 teaching of the Portland Traffic and Transportation course. As in other years, the curriculum is largely based around government agencies and departments, with heads of the respective entities asked to speak on each topic.

- **Session #1:** Transportation Shaping the City – History will include distribution of the course outline and materials; an explanation of class assignments and structure; and transportation project options presented with a questionnaire.
  - Chief Planner Steve Dotterrer will discuss historical perspectives and planning.
- **Session #2:** Overview of Transportation Issues, including Policy and Finance
  - City Commissioner Steve Novick is in charge of PBOT and will provide an overview of the issues facing the city.
  - PBOT Director Leah Treat will present the overview of PBOT with policy and finance as major subjects.
- **Session #3:** Regional Transportation
  - TriMet’s Alan Lehto will present the role of transit in the region.
  - Metro’s Andy Cotugno will present an overview on the Regional Transportation Plan and discuss travel demand, relationships of modes and coordination process.
- **Saturday Oct, 19 Site Visits**
- **Session #4:** Major Transportation Decisions and Bicycling
  - Dick Feeney, executive director of TriMet Government Relations (retired) and Rick Gustafson will discuss the Mt. Hood Freeway and light rail, two major transportation decisions made in the ‘70s that have shaped Portland’s development in the past 40 years.
  - Roger Geller, PBOT bicycle coordinator, will lead a discussion on the policies for encouraging cycling in Portland.
- **Session #5:** Engineering and Systems (including signals and parking)
  - Greg Jones of PBOT will discuss transportation engineering and development.
  - Peter Koonce of PBOT will discuss the systems used to manage Portland’s transportation system.
  - Marni Glick of PBOT will discuss the city’s role in parking management.
- **Session #6:** Transit Planning and Active Transportation
  - Art Pearce, PBOT, will present the process the city is conducting to identify primary transit networks.
  - Dan Bower, PBOT active transportation division manager, will give an overview of the new division and its work.
  - April Bertelsen, PBOT’s pedestrian coordinator, will present the city’s program for pedestrian improvements.
- **Session #7:** Land Use and Transportation – Visiting Guest Lecture
  - Gordon Price, city program director, Simon Fraser University and former member of the Vancouver B.C. City Council, will make a presentation on the effective integration of transportation in high-density environments, with an emphasis on land use.
- **Session #8:** Project Presentations to the Class
  - Students will present class projects for discussion and review with Gustafson.
• **Session #9: Project Presentations to Panel**
  o Gustafson will select projects for presentation to a panel of reviewers that include Leah Treat, PBOT director; Chris Warner, chief of staff for Commissioner Novick; and Chris Smith, citizen advocate and member of the Portland Planning Commission.

### 1.6 COURSE PROJECT

At the beginning of the course term, students are asked to identify a transportation issue or problem that they’ve observed to use for their course project. The course project topic may be some safety problem that they’ve observed on a neighborhood street, or it may be a gap in the transportation system or a problem with transit. Students are asked to contact someone at a city agency about their problem/issue, and to be persistent in doing so. At the end of the course, students are asked to give a brief three-minute presentation on their problem, who they spoke to about the problem, what they learned, and what their proposed solution is (even if they learned that their solution might not be feasible). Selected projects are presented before a panel of city transportation leaders.

### 1.7 OTHER COMPARABLE COURSES

#### 1.7.1 Surrey Transportation Lecture Program

Modeled on the Portland Traffic and Transportation course, the City of Surrey, B.C., in collaboration with Simon Frasier University, launched its Transportation Lecture Series course in 2010. Similar to the Portland course, the Surrey course is a weekly class (with around 10 sessions per term) that features guest talks from transportation agency staff and leaders from Surrey and Vancouver. It also includes a site visit session to observe transportation problems and solutions in person, and course projects and presentations. The course costs $20 for Surrey residents and $105 for non-Surrey residents, plus an additional $100 check which is destroyed if the participant attends 80% of the classes.²

The fall 2014 program featured the following sessions³:

- **Session 1:** Introduction and Overview; Participant introductions; Course overview; Transportation in the City of Surrey (CoS Engineering); Motordom: The historical context of transportation in Metro Vancouver (Gordon Price)

---


1.7.2 Planning Academy

Citizen planning academies operate in a number of communities in the United States. They tend to be more focused on planning processes, and less so on topics like operations and engineering that are more important to understanding transportation. Still, they have a similar goal of getting citizens involved in decision-making processes that affect their community, and offer insight into how to effectively structure and operate such a course. The concept and structure of citizen planning academies were discussed in greater detail in the background section. A few examples of citizen planning academies are described below.

1.7.2.1 Citizens Planning Institute – Philadelphia

The Citizens Planning Institute in Philadelphia is the “official education and outreach arm” of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The course is structured as a three-evening, “101” level set of classes, along with three elective classes and a course project. The goal of the course is to “educate citizens about the role good planning and implementation play in helping to create communities of lasting value” and to build “a constituency for good planning.”4 Classes are held on midweek evenings for three hours each and include a meal. They are led by city staff and

---

other experts. Course materials including lecture slides are available on the course website (http://citizensplanninginstitute.org/materials/).

Class titles include:

- **Session # 1:** The Big Picture – Planning in the City
- **Session # 2:** Land Use and Zoning 101
- **Session # 3:** The Development Process – Nuts & Bolts
- Presentations & Pizza Workshop
- **Elective 1:** Climate Change Preparedness
- **Elective 2:** The Land Bank & Community Access
- **Elective 3:** Equitable Development

### 1.7.2.2 Citizens Academy of Planning – Las Vegas

Las Vegas’ Citizens Academy of Planning is a set of 10 90-minute classes held over a 10-week period. The course is “designed to provide educational outreach opportunities to community members who strengthen institutions and relationships, and support healthy and sustainable communities.”

Classes are led by city planning staff or other topic experts. They are held on weekday evenings and feature a one-hour presentation and 30 minutes of discussion time. The course website (http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/Government/23294.htm) contains PowerPoint versions of several class presentations for download.

Class titles include:

- **Session # 1:** History of Planning
- **Session # 2:** Master Plan
- **Session # 3:** Unified Development Code
- **Session # 4:** CLV Eplan, Applications, Permits & Licensing
- **Session # 5:** Special Area Plans
- **Session # 6:** Public Hearing Process
- **Session # 7:** Planning Commission Meeting
- **Session # 8:** Website Resources
- **Session # 9:** Historic Preservation
- **Session # 10:** Other Departments & Graduation

### 1.7.2.3 Citizen’s Planning Academy – Sacramento

Sacramento’s Citizen’s Planning Academy has the stated objective of “assist[ing] participants in becoming more effective and informed advocates in future City of Sacramento planning efforts,

---

and [encouraging] positive engagement in the planning process.” Courses take place on weekday nights (with two Saturday tours), and are generally led by city staff, local planners and architects, elected officials and business leaders. The course website (http://portal.cityofsacramento.org/Community-Development/Planning/Long-Range/Planning-Academy) contains numerous PDF presentations available for download.

Class titles include:

- **Session # 1:** Planning 101 (Part 1) - Planning/Smart Growth Overview
- **Session # 2:** Planning 101 (Part 2) – Regional Planning and the General Plan: Regional Planning; General Planning
- **Session # 3:** Planning 101 (Part 3) - Planning and Development Code: Planning and Development Code; Design Review
- **Session # 4:** Planning 101 (Part 4) - Historic Preservation and CEQA Urban Design and Housing
- **Session:** Saturday Tour #1
- **Session # 5:** The Development Review Process in the Real World
- **Session:** Saturday Tour #2
- **Session # 6:** Smart Growth and Health
- **Session # 7:** Climate Change and Adaptation
- **Session # 8:** Transportation Planning
- **Session # 9:** Planning for Economic Development
- **Session # 10:** Panel Discussion-Smart Growth and Citizen Involvement
- **Session:** Graduation-Reception

---

2.0 PORTLAND TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION COURSE SURVEY

This section outlines initial findings from a survey of people enrolled in the Portland Traffic and Transportation (PTT) course. The purpose of the survey was to understand the experiences of people who have taken the course; their motivations for taking it; what they liked about it and what they would change about it; and how they have been involved in transportation decision-making in their communities since taking the course.

2.1 METHODOLOGY

2.1.1 Developing Survey Questions

The first steps in developing a survey about the PTT course were to understand the current curriculum both in terms of its goals and its implementation. Interviews conducted with the city’s liaison, the course instructor and people involved in the course’s creation helped me to understand the intentions of the course. Course materials, included the syllabus, presentations and other documents, and sitting in on class sessions provided further details. Finally, a literature review and interviews conducted around the country with experts in citizen education and public involvement further informed methods to evaluate the course and begin to assess how successful it has been in meeting its goals. These inputs informed the organization and format of the survey.

The survey was broken into several components, with opportunities for respondents to provide concrete feedback (in the form of likert ratings) along with ample opportunity to provide narrative feedback in an attempt to elicit stories about their experiences. The survey was presented in the following sections:

- Survey overview and informed consent
- Motivations for taking the course
- Experience taking the course
- Involvement in community and transportation activities
- Travel behavior and demographics

A draft of the survey was reviewed by the PBOT course liaison, the course instructor and the PSU course administrator, and some small changes were made to the wording and response options.

The survey text was adapted to an online format through Qualtrics, a provider of online survey software through which PSU has a license. Through the Qualtrics online system, a survey panel
of potential participants (i.e., PTT course enrollees) can each be sent an email with a unique link. This system allows reminders to be sent to only those who have yet to complete the survey.

2.1.2 Implementing the Survey

Working with PBOT and the PTT course instructor, contact information was obtained for students of the 14 most recent courses, dating back to winter 2002 (some years had more than one course taught per year). Approximately 388 course enrollees were included in the lists. Of these, a handful did not have email addresses listed (email was the planned method for distributing the survey), and about 33 had invalid emails that bounced back.

Prior to sending out a link to the online survey, PBOT’s course liaison sent an email to a list of prior enrollees with the goal of informing them about the study and making them aware that they would soon be receiving the survey request.

As a means of reaching some course participants that either had no email addresses or had changed email addresses, an additional appeal was sent out to local transportation-related listservs. To encourage participation in the survey, everyone who completed the survey was able to enter a drawing for one of 10 prizes worth about $25 each. Drawing winners were able to choose between a 10-pack of TriMet tickets, a $25 gift card to the Bike Gallery or the PSU Bike Hub, or a $25 gift card to Amazon.com.

2.2 SURVEY PARTICIPANTS / DEMOGRAPHICS

2.2.1 Response Rates

Of the 388 course graduates sought to respond to the survey, six had no listed email address and were not otherwise reachable. Of the remainder, 142 clicked on the survey link, 126 answered some questions, and 111 completed the entire survey. Of those who answered some or all questions, most spent in the range of either 11-20 minutes (24%) or 21-30 (22%) minutes answering questions. A subset took greater than 120 minutes (18%), though most of those appear to have stopped taking the survey for some period of time and then returned later to complete the survey.

2.2.2 Transportation Characteristics of Respondents

Because the class is geared toward transportation decision-making, the topic of the transportation characteristics of the class participants is relevant.

In terms of the types of transportation options available to people, survey respondents were very multimodal. Although almost all of the respondents (98%) had a valid driver’s license, only about 72% owned or leased a registered motor vehicle, compared to 90% who had a functioning bicycle in the household, and 32% who possessed a current transit pass (a “7, 14 or 30 day pass” was specified in the question, to contrast with possessing a single-use type pass).
### Table 1 Travel Options Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Driver's License</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Transit Pass (e.g., 7, 14 or 30 day pass)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning Bicycle</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the actual trips that respondents reported taking, bicycling was the most commonly reported commute mode, which puts this group in stark contrast to the city of Portland as a whole. For each of four modes of transportation (including motor vehicle, walking, bicycling and public transportation), along with the option of entering an “other,” respondents were asked if they use that mode for “most trips,” “some trips,” or “no trips.” They were asked to respond for both commute trips and for other types of trips. For commute trips, 43% indicated they used a bicycle for most trips, compared to 24% for motor vehicles, 20% for public transportation and 15% for walking. For non-commute trips, most respondents appear to be more multimodal, selecting multiple modes for “some trips.” Motor vehicle use was also somewhat more common for non-commute trips, with 31% using that mode for most trips.

### Table 2 Frequency of Travel by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commute Trips (to/from work school)*</th>
<th>Other Trips*</th>
<th>Portland Primary Commute mode***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most Trips</td>
<td>Some Trips</td>
<td>No Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car/truck/motor vehicle (including carpool)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are based on 102 respondents that completed this section. If they did not select a response to a particular mode, they were marked as taking “no trips” by that mode.

**Respondents indicated “other”, wrote in options including skateboarding, scooter, jogging, work at home, and car sharing (though this could also fall under “car/truck”)

***ACS 2013 3 year data for the City of Portland

As another measure of the ways in which the survey respondents get around on a daily basis, they were asked when they last took a trip by each mode. Walking, though not cited as a major commute mode, was nonetheless the mode most likely to have been used by respondents in the past two days – 75% made a walking trip in the past two days, while 90% made a walking trip within the past week. Driving and bicycling were the next most likely to have been used in the past two days (54% and 47%, respectively) or past week (69% and 64%, respectively).
Table 3 When Did You Last Use the Following Modes of Transportation to Take a Trip?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Transportation</th>
<th>In the past 2 days</th>
<th>In the past week</th>
<th>In the past month</th>
<th>In the past year</th>
<th>More than a year ago</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving a (personal) car</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger in a (personal) car</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet Bus</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX / WES</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Vehicle</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit service (e.g. LIFT, etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 Basic Demographic Information

The age split of respondents skewed slightly younger, with 58% falling into the 25-34 and 35-44 age groups. Still, with 42% in the 45-54, 55-64 and 65+ groups, there was a good degree of variety in age. Just over half the respondents were male (52%). The respondents were predominantly white, at 94%, with no other group at higher than 3%; no one indicated that they consider themselves black or African American. A separate study of participants in citizen planning academy classes in Colorado Springs, Sacramento and Orange County also found that white participants were also significantly overrepresented when compared to city populations overall (Marcus, 2007, pg. 85).

Table 4 Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Portland Residents (18+)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>490,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data
Table 5 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Option Selected</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Portland Residents (18+)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Other response</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>490,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data

Table 6 Race/Ethnicity of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider yourself: (select all that apply)</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Portland Residents (all)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/a</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>603,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data

Table 7 Employment Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status (all that apply)</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Portland Residents (16+)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work outside the home</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work from home</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed at this time</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to school outside the home</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>501,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data; **Includes those not in labor force

Table 8 Educational Attainment of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Portland Residents (25+)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school or less</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate’s degree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college degree</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>436,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data
2.2.4 Household Information

Two-thirds or respondents were homeowners. About one in five respondents live alone, while two-thirds live in two adult households. Just under a quarter (23%) has a child in the household. The median household occupancy was around five years (49% less than five and 51% more than five). In terms of where respondents live, the majority come from closer-in neighborhoods in North, Northeast and Southeast Portland.

Table 9 Home Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Ownership</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>City of Portland Households*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>251,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data

Table 10 Number of People in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Size</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>City of Portland Households*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HHs w/o Children</td>
<td>HHs w/Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 +</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data

Table 11 Years Living in Current Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in HH</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>City of Portland Households*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3 years</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 13 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 23 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+ years</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>251,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data
Table 12 Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income Range</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>City of Portland Households*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>251,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2013 ACS City of Portland 3-year data

Figure 1 Respondents Mapped by Home Zip Code (Source: Survey and RLIS)
2.3 SURVEY RESULTS

2.3.1 Reasons for Taking the PTT Course

The first section of the survey asked respondents about how they heard about the PTT course, and why they decided to enroll. The first two questions were open-ended and provided space for the respondents to answer the two above questions in their own words. The responses were tagged to identify themes in the responses.

In terms of how people found out about the course, six different responses were cited by 10% or more of the respondents, suggesting that people are hearing about the course through a wide variety of sources. Via a friend or word of mouth was the most common response, at 28%. However, quite a few also heard about the course from an online source (17%); a neighborhood association or civic group (14%); a city source such as a staff recommendation or newsletter (13%); a professional colleague (10%); or though PSU (10%).

Table 13 How Did You Hear About the Course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categorization</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a friend or by word of mouth</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via an online blog or listserv</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a neighborhood association or other civic group</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a city resource or staff person</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a professional colleague</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Portland State University</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through an advocacy group</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a course instructor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via personal research</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asked to indicate why they actually chose to enroll in the class, over half of respondent answers mentioned personal enrichment. Examples of responses in this category included:

- “I was “generally interested in the topic”;
- “I need to learn more about transportation issues”;
- “I am generally interested in transportation issues, specifically bike and public transportation”; and,
- “I don’t have a car so public transportation issues interest me”; and,
- “I thought it would be interesting and informative.”

After personal enrichment, the next most commonly cited reason for enrolling in the course was for professional enrichment. Examples include:

- “I was just starting my career in transportation advocacy and I wanted to learn more about it”; and,
- “I was interested in working in the transportation field. I thought the class would help me decide and look good on my resume.”
Related to the general personal enrichment responses, an additional 15% indicated that they enrolled in order to better understand the transportation system and/or decision-making process. Examples of this include:

- I “was concerned about a few local transportation issues, and wanted to learn more about how things get done in Portland”; and,
- “To help me understand the policy process and stakeholders in the transportation plan.”

Another popularly cited reason involved some variation on becoming better able to address a transportation issue: 12% enrolled to be better advocates for transportation issues; 9% to help in their neighborhood associations; 6% to address a specific transportation problem; and 4% to improve transportation generally. A total of 30% of respondents indicated one of these issues. A few examples are:

- “To better understand Portland's transportation system, and to be better able to make changes to the system”;
- “It seemed to be a good next step in becoming a more capable and powerful local advocate”;  
- “I am interesting in learning how to improve transportation choices to people in the world and what are the issues that people face which prevent us from reaching those goals”;  
- “To help me be a more informed, more effective citizen advocate for transportation-related issues”; and,  
- “I was very concerned about a traffic issue in my community.”

The course also attracts people who view it as a means of becoming involved with other people working in transportation. Eleven percent indicated this as a motivation for enrolling in the class, with several of these citing the course as a way for newcomers to Portland to become engaged with like-minded transportation enthusiasts. For example:

- “I love learning about transportation and I specifically moved to Portland to become more involved in the transportation scene”;
- “I love learning and I was hoping to get both more background in the hows and why of our region's current design, and to find tools to influence its future design usefully, and hopefully identify some allies for doing so”;  
- “I wanted to connect with other people in Portland who were interested in transportation issues”;  
- “It sounded interesting. I wanted to get more involved with neighborhood advocacy and bicycling”; and,  
- “I recently moved to Portland and was interested in transportation. I thought this class would be a good way to meet people and get an introduction to the transportation scene.”
Table 14 Why Did You Decide to Take the Class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categorization</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For personal enrichment</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For professional enrichment</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better understand the transportation system and/or decision making process</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To better advocate</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get involved in transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help in neighborhood association activities</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address a specific transportation issue</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the PSU credit or experience</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve transportation generally</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In combination with the open-ended questions asking why they enrolled in the class, respondents were also asked to rate, from “not important” (1) to “most important” (5), a series of factors potentially influencing their decision to enroll. Each factor was rated independently, meaning that a respondent could potentially rate all factors as “most important” (i.e., this was not a ranking question). The question and response options are shown in Figure 2. The mean rating of each factor is presented in Table 15, ordered from the highest average rating to the lowest average rating. As with the open-ended response, the factor rated the most important was a personal interest in learning about the transportation system. Interest in becoming involved in transportation decision-making also rated quite highly here, with a mean rating of 3.9 on the one-to-five scale. However, the “interest in becoming involved” question here is quite broad, and likely was reported as important by people interested in becoming involved professionally, in their local/neighborhood decisions, socially (e.g., interest in being involved with like-minded people), or a combination of all three. A few factors had relatively high standard deviations, including professional interest, recommendation of a prior course participant, and leadership and/or involvement in a neighborhood association. For some people, these factors were quite important, while for many others they were not very influential in their decision to enroll.
Table 15 Decision to Take PTT Course: Rated Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent Stating this factor was most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in becoming involved in transportation issues and decision-making</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about a particular transportation problem or issue</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community planning processes</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of prior course participant</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to guest instructors and transportation leaders</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community activism groups</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to course instructors</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role (e.g., land use chair) in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, these responses about how people found out about the course and why they decided to enroll paint the picture of a course that has permeated through several layers of culture in Portland. People are finding out about the course both through word of mouth (socially and professionally) and through other official or quasi-official channels (e.g., through the city, through a transportation blog, etc.). Enrollment decisions were made for a variety of reasons based on a variety of personal and professional goals, ranging from being “generally interested in the topic” to looking to start “working in the transportation field.” In between those two extremes of casualness to determined motivation were a range of more utilitarian reasons and goals, from better understanding of how the transportation system around them works to feeding a desire to be more effective in advocating for the system they would like to see.

Demographic differences appear to play some role in the degree to which respondents rated the importance of the various factors on their decisions to enroll. The mean ratings for each factor, broken down by various demographic characteristics, are shown in Table 16. Note that for the employment-related variables (work outside the home, work from home, and not employed at this time), respondents were able to select all that apply; thus, groups are presented as those that selected that option (yes) and those that did not (no). Significant differences between groups of individual factors are marked with an asterisk and highlighted. A few findings emerge here:

- Differences by age suggest that for younger course participants, personal interest and professional interest were more important factors than they were for older participants. Conversely, involvement in a neighborhood association was a more important factor in the decision to enroll in the class for older participants.
• On a related note, homeowners were much more likely to state that involvement in their neighborhood association was an important factor in deciding to enroll (not surprisingly, age and home ownership had a strong correlation – 45% of those under 45 years old are renters, while only 16% of those over 45 rent their own). Homeowners were also more likely to rate involvement in a community planning process as a factor in enrolling.

• Employment variables show that participants who work outside the home are less likely to cite involvement in community activism groups or recommendations from prior course participants as factors in their decision to enroll. Conversely, those who work from home were more likely to state that involvement in their neighborhood association, involvement in community activism groups and planning processes, and recommendations from prior course participants were factors for them.

• No significant differences were observed by gender or by income.

Table 17 examines differences based on specifically transportation-related factors, including where they indicated that they are “currently involved in transportation decisions or planning that affect their neighborhood or community,” car-ownership status, and what type of modes they use for commuting purposes. Significant findings from this table include:

• Not surprisingly, people who indicated that they are currently involved in transportation rated their involvement in community activism and planning processes as more important than those not currently involved in transportation. This group also rated the recommendation of a past participant as a more important factor.

• Participants who own a car were more likely to state that involvement in their neighborhood association was an important factor, and less likely to state that access to guest instructors and transportation leaders was a factor.

• Participants who commute by car some or most of the time also rated their involvement or leadership role in their neighborhood association as a more important factor.

• There were no significant differences observed between those who commute by bike or foot sometimes or most of the time, compared to those who never do.

• Participants who commute by transit some or most of the time were less likely to state that involvement in community planning processes were a motivating factor in their decision to enroll.

While the differences discussed do matter in terms of understanding the potential appeal of the course to different segments of the population, it’s also important to note that across all groups, the most important factor remained the participants personal interest in learning about the transportation system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work outside home</th>
<th>Works from home</th>
<th>Not employed</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Home ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;45</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in becoming involved in transportation issues and decision-making</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role (e.g., land use chair) in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community activism groups</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community planning processes</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of prior course participant</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to course instructors</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to guest instructors and transportation leaders</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about a particular transportation problem or issue</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = independent t-test significant at 0.1; ** = significant at 0.05; *** = significant at 0.01
Table 17 Decision to Enroll, Differences by Transportation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Currently involved in transp.</th>
<th>Car Ownership</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Car</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Foot</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Bike</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some or Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest in learning about Portland’s transportation system</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in becoming involved in transportation issues and decision-making</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership role (e.g., land use chair) in your local neighborhood association</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community activism groups</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community planning processes</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of prior course participant</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to course instructors</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in access to guest instructors and transportation leaders</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about a particular transportation problem or issue</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 68, 46, 79, 31, 37, 65, 39, 54, 26, 72, 27, 72

* = independent t-test significant at 0.1; ** = significant at 0.05; *** = significant at 0.01
2.3.2 Experience Taking the Course

The next section of the survey focused on the experience that the respondent had taking the course, from the value received and understanding gained from various course elements and topic areas, to the ways in which they would want to see the course changed.

Participants were also asked if they took the class for PSU credit. Only 6% (or seven respondents) stated that they were taking the course for PSU credit. While this low number of respondents for this subgroup do not negate the benefits of having the course take place in a university setting (including providing a neutral/academic setting), it does present a challenge to specifically assess the impact of the class as a PSU student course. All respondents were also asked if they attended “most” of the class meetings and almost everyone (99%) stated that they did.

Respondents were asked about various components of the course, such as the course lectures/presentations, work on the class project, and course field trip. The survey asked people to rate how much value they got out of each element on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “not valuable at all” to 5 being “very valuable,” as shown in Figure 3. Table 18 provides the mean rating and percentage of respondents rating the item as very valuable. The special guest presentations stand out as being viewed as the most valuable aspect of the course by a large number of respondents. Nearly three out of every four respondents (72%) rated this component of the course a 5 out of 5, and the mean of all respondents was a 4.66/5. The teaching of the course instructor and the site visit were also rated highly, with about half of the respondents rating them 5/5 and receiving an average rating above 4/5. Of the remaining course components included in the survey, the average rating fell just about the midpoint on the scale of 3, or “somewhat valuable.”

A separate question asked respondents if they had completed a personal class project – 64% indicated that they had done so. Some of the 36% who did not complete a class project still rated the components of their “individual work on a personal class project,” “course requirement to reach out to city staff” (a requirement related to addressing their project problem), and the “feedback received about personal class project.”
Table 18 Value Rating of Course Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Component</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% rating 5/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special guest presentations</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of the course instructor</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit / tour of transportation facilities</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual work on personal class project</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to interact and make connections with course presenters</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to interact and make connections with classmates</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course requirement to reach out to city staff</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received about personal class project</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The response scale ranged from (1): “not valuable at all” to (5): “very valuable”. Respondents could also mark “N/A – I did not experience this item” (excluded from analysis).

Related to the course components question, respondents were asked to rate the value of the course in terms of their personal self-enrichment and as a catalyst for increasing their role in the community. Table 19 provides the mean rating for these two elements, along with the percentage of respondents rating the item 5/5, or very valuable. Nearly two-thirds rated the course as a 5, or very valuable, in terms of personal self-enrichment. Just over a third rated the course as very valuable as a catalyst for increasing their role in the community.

Table 19 Value Rating of Select Course Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Value</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% rating 5/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-enrichment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a catalyst for increasing my role in the community</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The response scale ranged from (1): “not valuable at all” to (5): “very valuable”. Respondents could also mark “N/A – I did not experience this item”.

A few significant differences between how different demographic groups rated the value of the various course elements emerged. The mean value rating of course elements by different demographic factors are shown in Table 20. As with the rating of the factors for enrolling in the course, there were no significant differences between gender and income groups. Among the significant differences observed were:

- Participants over 45 years of age rated the teaching of the course instructor and the site visit elements of the course as more valuable than those under 45.
- Those who work outside the home rated the teaching of the course instructor as less valuable, while those who stated that they were not currently employed rated the course as less valuable in terms of personal self-enrichment than those who are currently employed.
- Renters rated the value received from the opportunity to interact and make connections with classmates as more valuable than those who own their homes.
More significant differences emerged between participants grouped by transportation factors, as shown in Table 21:

- Those who indicated that they are currently involved in transportation decisions or planning that affect their neighborhood rated the value of the special guest presentation significantly higher than those not currently involved in transportation.
- Participants who are not car owners rated the opportunity to interact and make connections with course presenters and with classmates as more valuable than car owners.
- Those who commute by car rate the site tour as more valuable than those who never do.
- One of the more interesting differences is that course participants who commute by foot found more value in the work on their class project, the course requirement to reach out to city staff, and the feedback received on the project.
- Both those who commute by bike and those who commute by transit rate the value received from the course instructor and the site tour as less valuable than others. Those who commute by bike some or most of the time also valued the opportunity to interact with course presenters and with classmates more highly than others.
Table 20 Course Element Value Ratings, Differences by Demographic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Element</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work outside the home</th>
<th>Work from home</th>
<th>Not employed</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Home ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;45</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of the course instructor</td>
<td>4.2 *</td>
<td>4.5 *</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6 **</td>
<td>4.2 **</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special guest presentations</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit / tour of transportation facilities</td>
<td>4 *</td>
<td>4.4 *</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual work on personal class project</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course requirement to reach out to city staff</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received about personal class project</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to interact and make connections with course presenters</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Opportunity to interact and make connections with classmates | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.9 * | 3.5 *
| Personal self-enrichment | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.5 * | 4.1 * | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 |
| As a catalyst for increasing my role in the community | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| n | 63 | 45 | 56 | 49 | 34 | 77 | 85 | 26 | 94 | 17 | 53 | 47 | 37 | 71 |

* = independent t-test significant at 0.1; ** = significant at 0.05; *** = significant at 0.01
Table 21 Course Element Value Ratings, Differences by Transportation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Element</th>
<th>Currently involved in transp.</th>
<th>Car Ownership</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Car</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Foot</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Bike</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some or Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of the course instructor</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special guest presentations</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit / tour of transportation facilities</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual work on personal class project</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course requirement to reach out to city staff</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received about personal class project</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to interact and make connections with course presenters</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to interact and make connections with classmates</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-enrichment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a catalyst for increasing my role in the community</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=independent t-test significant at 0.1; **=significant at 0.05; ***=significant at 0.01
2.3.3 Understanding Gained of Various Topics

The next component of the survey asked respondents to rate how much they learned in the PTT course about a variety of topics, with responses ranging from [1] I learned nothing about this in the course to [6] I gained a deep understanding of this issue in the course. The question-and-response options are shown in Figure 4. Mean ratings of understanding gained are presented in Table 22, sorted by highest to lowest mean rating. This set of questions was followed by another set of questions asking if the respondent would choose to revise the course to change the amount of time and focus devoted to each topic. Note that not every item asked about was explicitly a component of the course curriculum. For example, some of the more applied topics of effective communication, methods of advocating and engaging neighbors, are not explicitly a piece of the curriculum but may be important aspects of engaging in transportation decision-making. Including these items in the survey help to understand how much these types of skills are implicitly being taught in the course or conveyed alongside other curricular items, or alternatively if they are not being conveyed. The revision question also provided respondents a means of expressing whether they thought these topics should be included.

![Figure 4 Screenshot of Understanding Gained Question and Rating Scale](image)

The top-rated topics (in terms of how thorough an understanding the course participants gained of that topic) were those that most broadly shaped the transportation landscape: the evolution of the Portland transportation system over time; the roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland; and urban design factors that influence transportation (and vice versa). Each of these topics was rated between 4.6 and 4.9 out of 6, with 60-70% of respondents responding with a 5 or 6 on each item. While not perfect, these ratings suggest that course participants are gaining a fairly strong understanding of these items. These three topics also form a fairly solid foundation for an understanding of how city transportation functions and are correspondingly foundations of the course curriculum. It’s encouraging that respondents feel that they are generally being conveyed quite effectively.

A second tier of understanding appears to be centered around the factors that guide and influence transportation agencies, including the fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions; the available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues; factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues; and factors that planners consider when making decisions about...
transportation issues. These topics, while still major component of the course curriculum, involve decision-making processes that are often complicated, sometimes opaque and rarely straightforward.

The remaining topics are generally centered on the notion of how citizens can be involved in transportation decision-making. While most of these items are not the subject of specific lessons, the course requirement that students address a transportation problem, contact agency staff to discuss the problem, and identify a potential solution speaks to some of these topics. The first three topics in this category focus more on specifically interacting with transportation agencies and decision-makers: collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern; giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers; and who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in a particular neighborhood. These three topics were rated between 3.6 and 3.9 out of 6 in terms of understanding gained, which is just above the midpoint of 3.5 (on the 1 to 6 scale). Understanding on these topics may have come from the class lessons about agency operations or from the class project requirements.

The last grouping of topics pertained more to the applied efforts to be involved in the decision-making process. These topics, or the need for understanding them, might come into play when seeking to take a class project from an idea to a reality: effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees around transportation issues; methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system (e.g., organizing a petition/campaign); methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue (e.g., organizing and leading a neighborhood meeting); and the use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc. These four topics received the lowest ratings, each falling below the midpoint of 3.5.
### Table 22 Understanding Gained of Transportation Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>5 or 6 out of 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design factors that influence transportation (and vice versa)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation and traffic issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about a transportation concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in my</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community members and</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency employees around transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., organizing a petition/campaign)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue (e.g.,</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizing and leading a neighborhood meeting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The response scale ranged from (1): “Did not learn anything about this” to (6): “Gained a deep understanding of this topic.”

Compared to the reasons cited for enrolling in the course and the value gained from the course elements, there were fewer differences between groups based on demographic and transportation factors in terms of the level of understanding gained. Mean ratings of understanding gained by demographic groupings are shown in Table 23. Among the observed differences were:

- Those under age 45 felt they gained a greater understanding of the available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues.
- No differences between men and women were observed.
- Those who work outside the home rated their understanding gained of giving testimony or framing an argument to be effectively heard by decision makers as lower than those who don’t work outside the home.
- Those who indicated that they are not currently employed felt they gained a lesser understanding of urban design factors that influence transportation than those who are employed.
Higher-income participants rated their understanding gained of urban design factors as higher than lower-income participants; however, higher-income participants rated their understanding gained about collecting evidence or data as lesser than lower-income participants.

Renters were rated in their understanding gained of the evolution of Portland transportation over time, factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues, and the use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast as higher than homeowners.

A few significant differences emerged between participants grouped by transportation factors, as shown in Table 24:

- Those currently involved in transportation issues felt that their understanding gained of effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees was higher than those not involved in transportation.
- Those involved in transportation and those who never commute by car indicated that their understanding gained of the use of technology and media was higher.
- Interestingly, those who never commute by bicycle or by transit indicated that their understanding gained of the fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions was higher than those who take some or most of their commute trips by those modes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work outside home</th>
<th>Work from home</th>
<th>Not employed</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Home ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;45</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design factors that influence transportation (and vice versa)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in my neighborhood</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees around transportation issues</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system (e.g., organizing a petition/campaign)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue (e.g., organizing and leading a neighborhood meeting)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = independent t-test significant at 0.1; ** = significant at 0.05; *** = significant at 0.01
Table 24 Understanding Gained by Topic, Differences by Transportation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Currently involved in transp.</th>
<th>Car Ownership</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Car</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Foot</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Bike</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some or Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design factors that influence transportation (and vice versa)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation and traffic issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument about a transportation concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heard by decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members and agency employees around transportation issues</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=independent t-test significant at 0.1; **=significant at 0.05; ***=significant at 0.01
2.3.4 How Would They Revise the Curriculum?

Respondents were also asked if they would revise the PTT curriculum to include more or less time/focus on each of the above topics (with the exception of the “Urban design factors” question, which was omitted from the revisions question due to an error). This question asked the respondent: “If you could revise the course, how do you think the amount of time/focus devoted to each topic should be changed?” Respondents could choose options between the topic should receive “much less time/focus” (-2), to the amount of time/focus the topic received was “just right” (0), to the topic should receive “much more time/focus” (2). The question instructions and response options are shown in Figure 5. Table 25 shows the mean responses, along with the percentage of respondents indicating that each topic should receive less attention, more attention or that the amount received was just right. Topics are sorted by the percentage of respondents indicating the focus was just right.

In general, the topics that received the highest overall understanding rating (Table 22) tended to best satisfy respondents with regard to the amount of time and focus the topic received.
Table 25 Suggested Curriculum Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Less (-1 or -2 on scale)</th>
<th>% Just Right</th>
<th>% More (1 or 2 on scale)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees around transportation issues*</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues.</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.*</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in my neighborhood</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue*</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean revision ratings by the different demographic factors are shown in Table 26. Again the rating is based on a scale of -2 to +2, with 0 suggesting a mean rating of “no revision,” -2 being much less time/focus and +2 being much more time/focus should be devoted to the topic. The differences here are interesting because, as opposed to the prior demographic difference tables, there are significant differences between men and women on a few factors. Differences observed include:

- On the topics of giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers, methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue and use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast, women were significantly more likely than men to suggest that more time/focus be devoted to the topic.
- Those who were employed felt that more time/focus should be devoted to factors that planners consider when making decisions about transportation issues.
- Higher-income participants felt that more time/focus should be devoted to factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues compared to lower-income participants.
Lower-income participants felt that more time/focus should be devoted to giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers, and methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue, than higher-income participants.

Renters felt more time/focus should be spent on who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in their neighborhood, while owners felt that more time/focus should be devoted to the fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions.

On the different transportation factors, those who take some or most commute trips by bicycle had a number of different opinions on revisions to the curriculum, as shown in Table 27:

- Bicycle commuters indicated that they would place relatively less time/focus on the roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning. They would place relatively more time/focus on more applied topic areas, including:
  - Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern;
  - Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers;
  - Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue; and,
  - Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system.

- Other differences around transportation factor groups include:
  - Those currently involved in transportation felt that relatively less focus should be placed on the roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland.
  - Those who commute by car some or most of the time felt that relatively more focus should be placed on the evolution of Portland’s transportation system over time.
  - Those who commute by foot some or most of the time felt that relatively more focus should be put on collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern.
Table 26 Suggested Curriculum Revisions, Differences by Demographic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work outside</th>
<th>Work from</th>
<th>Not employed</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Home ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;45</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in my neighborhood</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues.</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3 *</td>
<td>.5 *</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1 **</td>
<td>.5 **</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1 ***</td>
<td>.5 ***</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees around transportation issues</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=independent t-test significant at 0.1; **=significant at 0.05; ***=significant at 0.01

Portland Traffic and Transportation Course – Case Study - 43
Table 27 Suggested Curriculum Revisions, Differences by Transportation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Currently involved in transp.</th>
<th>Car Ownership</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Car</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Foot</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Bike</th>
<th>Commute Trips by Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evolution of the Portland transportation system over time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some or Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of different agencies and organizations involved in transportation planning in Portland</td>
<td>0.3 *</td>
<td>5 *</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in my neighborhood</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fiscal and policy constraints that agencies face when making transportation-related decisions</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that planners consider when making decisions about transportation issues</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of technology/media to campaign/document/broadcast/etc.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language and dialogue to engage community members and agency employees around transportation issues</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = independent t-test significant at 0.1; ** = significant at 0.05; *** = significant at 0.01
2.3.5 Most Important Thing Learned

Respondents were asked to explain the most important thing they learned in the PTT course. Out of the 117 people who took the survey, 109 filled in text responses to this question. Those responses were coded into response categories for analysis. Some responses covered one or more topics, and were therefore assigned to one or more categories. The categories and percentage of responses coded into each category are shown in Table 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents commenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System and Process Topics</td>
<td>Understanding Transportation Context</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Process / Budget</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Roles</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planner Roles</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering / Systems</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total – Transportation Topics</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Transportation</td>
<td>How to Participate</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigating Real Problems</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total – Participation in Transportation</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Meeting People</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure to the Topic of Transportation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Leaders</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Issue</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Trip</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total - Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| n                                   |                                     | 109                                  |

Not surprisingly, for most respondents the most important thing they learned had to do with some aspect of the transportation system and process. Of the 74% of responses that were categorized into this grouping, 40% pertained to gaining an understanding of the general transportation context in Portland. The next most common responses pertained to understanding the transportation policy process, along with agency and planner roles in that process. Examples of these responses are included below:

Understanding Transportation Context:
- “The most important thing for me was learning about the broader context (history, agencies and activists involved, design criteria and approaches) of transportation issues in Portland.”
- “The history of Portland development. How we, human, impact the Portland traffic over the time.”
- “I really enjoyed learning about the historical development of the transportation system.”
- “How the evolution of transportation influences both modern infrastructure and design as well as policy and policymakers.”
Policy Process / Budget:
- “Structure of City bureaus around transportation, perspective of agency and political leaders.”
- “That there are a lot of different factors that come into play when determining transportation funding.”
- “The inner workings of the processes and procedures behind transportation planning.”
- “Motivations for transportation decisions, methods of financing, roles of agencies.”
- “If you want a transportation project funded by the City, you really should get it on a capital improvement priority list.”

Agency Roles:
- “The roles and responsibilities of agencies and professionals in relation to transportation in Portland.”
- “Understanding different agency jurisdictions and different street classifications.”
- “The history of Portland's transportation system and the various roles each agency plays in that system.”
- “Structure of City bureaus around transportation, perspective of agency and political leaders.”
- “How complicated transportation planning is and how many agencies and political interests are involved.”

Planner Roles:
- “The most important things I learned were the decision making processes used by planners and how to develop a valid and effective argument/presentation.”
- “Planner process in implementation.”
- “Specific people who are involved in planning, designing, and maintaining the transportation system.”

Engineering/Systems:
- “How varying transportation systems impact others and how varying systems work best with others.”
- “Fire Bureau considerations and how they affect transportation planning and engineering”
- “An understanding of how our Portland transportation system evolved and how the efforts of individuals with high ideals made all the difference. It was so inspiring. I came away with an understanding of just how important transportation systems and urban planning are in improving most aspects of quality of life.”

2.3.6 Open-Ended Question – How to Improve the Course

Respondents were also asked to explain what, if anything, they would do to improve the PTT course. Of the 109 respondents, 86 provided a response to this question. Of those who
responded, 10% indicated they would not change anything, while another 10% said they didn’t know what they would do to change the course.

Table 29 How to Improve the Course (Coded Open-Ended Question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Area</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area Suggestions</td>
<td>More on getting involved</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More diverse focus</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic to include</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on core transportation issues</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal – Category</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom and Time Management Suggs</td>
<td>Improve presenters / presentations</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More focus / management of student projects</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve site visits</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumed too much background knowledge</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More interaction with planners</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better discussion management</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal – Category</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and Materials</td>
<td>Increase length / frequency</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better course materials</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal – Category</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Activities</td>
<td>Alumni activities</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal – Category</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or no changes</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal – Category</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic Areas:** There were no particular suggested improvements that stood out in terms of receiving considerable agreement by a large percentage of respondents. Around a third of respondents suggested a topic area to include (or improve upon). Of these, the most common request was for more of a focus on the specifics of how to get involved and be effective. Examples of topic areas to add to the curriculum include:

- “A bit more practical how-to information.”
- “More *structure* on how to take your project to the authorities and make it happen.”
- “A little more guidance in community involvement, especially through the use of technology resources would be beneficial.”
- “I feel that it is important to work toward getting students to actually engage the public and advocate for their projects. I feel that some kind of follow up is necessary and more information on what to do next, after the course is complete, is crucial for the push needed to move the assignment forward.”

Another subgroup of topic area responses called for increasing the diversity of topics covered, including calling for more focus on pedestrian topics, transit topics, examples from other cities, “bad” transportation examples (particularly field trips), law enforcement perspective, more attention to car travel and suburban environments. A related group of responses call for adding
specific topics such as storm water management, focusing on technical tools like mapping or modeling, a discussion of transportation-related machinery, equity and displacement topics, and a suggestion for including a representative from an auditing or budgeting department.

Classroom and Time Management: Under the topic area of classroom time and time management suggestions, there were a number of suggestions, though few seemed to be repeated by more than a respondent or two. A few respondents complained about specific presentations or expressed that presenters represented “vested interests,” coming from inside agency bureaucracies. A few called for more organization and feedback around class presentations. Others called for more site visits to be incorporated into the course, including possibly site visits to student project sites, site visits to “deficient” infrastructure locations, or offering multiple dates for students with conflicts.

Course and Materials: The topic of course logistics, including timing and materials, was mentioned by a few respondents. Suggestions here included a call for more class time, either through more frequent or longer classes, or by breaking the class into a “history” section and an “action” section. Several people also wanted more opportunities for taking the course “home” with them, either through supplemental readings, recordings of presentations, or self-guided tour maps.

Alumni Activities: A few people requested additional opportunities for access to alumni of the course, either to merely meet and mingle (e.g., an alumni happy hour), or for an opportunity to regroup and discuss continuing concerns, update one another on their projects, solicit feedback on their challenges and share successes.

2.3.7 Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making

In an attempt to understand how involved respondents currently are in various aspects of transportation planning, respondents were asked how often they participated in transportation decision-making related activities. Asked if they are currently involved in transportation decisions or planning that affect their neighborhood or community, 60% said yes. Just over half of all respondents (54%) also said that their involvement was different before taking the Traffic and Transportation course. Respondents were then asked to indicate how frequently they partake in a variety of activities, ranging from attending meetings or open houses to leading or supporting campaigns to address transportation issues. The question instructions and response options are shown in Figure 6.
Responses to those questions are shown in Table 30. As shown in Figure 7, the percentage of respondents participating in each activity at least once year just about doubled from prior to taking the course. Of course, this does not imply a purely causal relationship. Some participants may have wanted to increase their participation, and therefore sought out and enrolled in the course, while other may have increased their civic participation as they aged or lived in their community longer. Still, the increase is dramatic.
### Table 30 Frequency of Participation Transportation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time-frame</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less 1x/year</th>
<th>1x to 4x/year</th>
<th>5+ times/year</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend a neighborhood association meeting</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a leadership role in your neighborhood association</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a community planning open house</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit comments/feedback as part of a planning campaign</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a government agency or official with a transportation-related concern</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a city council meeting</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a transportation-related committee meeting</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a campaign to address a transportation concern</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead/engage other community members in a campaign to address a transportation concern (e.g., organize a petition or letter writing campaign)</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring a friend or family member to one of the above meetings</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected data to demonstrate the need for some decision</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial support to a group or organization to support a transportation cause</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a point of comparison, a 2009 Pew Poll on civic and political involvement in American found that, within the past year 30% of American adults had contacted a national, state or local government official about an issue (compared to 68% of course participants that contact a government agency or official with a transportation-related concern at least once per year); and 28% work with fellow citizens to solve a problem in their community (compared with 60% participating in a campaign to address a transportation concern). Other civic involvement rates from the survey, which may compare roughly with measures shown in Figure 7, include: 24% attended a political meeting on local, town or school affairs in the past year; 18% contributed money to a political candidate or party or any other political organization or cause; and 15% were active members of a group that tries to influence public policy or government.
Respondents were also asked to state their level of agreement with several questions relating to change and involvement in transportation. Response options ranged from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. Mean responses are shown in Table 31, sorted by highest mean agreement. Some interesting significant differences in level of agreement arise when breaking down the respondents:

- Men and homeowners were significantly more likely than women and home renters to agree that important changes in transportation can happen in small incremental steps.
- People who bike more for commute trips and respondents 44 or younger were more likely to feel that important changes in transportation require large and bold steps.
- People who indicated that they work outside the home were more confident that if they bring a concern to a government agency, their concern would be taken seriously.
- People who bike more for commute trips were more likely to feel that, if they participate in a planning process, they have the right to demand accountability.
- People who indicated that they are currently involved in transportation decisions that affect their neighborhood or community were more likely to agree that important changes happen in small incremental steps, important changes require large and bold steps, and that their concerns would be taken seriously by government agencies.
Table 31 Attitudes about Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important changes in transportation can happen in small incremental steps</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I participate in a planning process, I have the right to demand accountability</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important changes in transportation require large and bold steps</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing a friend or family member to public meeting is important</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I bring a concern about a transportation issue to a government agency, I am confident that my concern would be heard and taken seriously</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.9 Levels of Satisfaction with Transportation

Table 32 reports on levels of reported satisfaction with transportation in the respondent’s neighborhood and in Portland. Mean satisfaction with transportation in their neighborhood was significantly lower for people who reported more trips by car, and significantly higher for people who reported more trips by bicycle (significant differences were not found for variations in walk and transit trips, nor for satisfaction with transportation in Portland). People who reported working from home were significantly less satisfied with transportation both in their neighborhood and in Portland generally. People who reported that they are currently involved in transportation decisions that affect their neighborhood or community reported being significantly more satisfied with transportation in their neighborhood.

Table 32 Satisfaction with Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my level of satisfaction with transportation in my neighborhood is ...</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my level of satisfaction with transportation in Portland is ...</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.10 Class Projects Discussion and Narratives

Respondents were asked if they completed a course project, to provide a brief description of the project, and to provide a brief description on any involvement on the issue subsequent to the course. From those providing project descriptions, responses were coded based on whether or not
their project proposed a solution to a specific problem (as opposed to projects that were described more as studies or exploration – e.g., exploring speeding or economic impacts of a transportation project). The responses on the subsequent involvement on the project/issue were coded to indicate if the proposed project had been implemented, and if the project implementation was the result of the course participant’s actions.

Of the 102 respondents who indicated that they completed a project, 68 proposed a specific solution to the problem identified. Of those, 28 projects were eventually implemented, with 22 of those projects being achieved wholly or partially due to the course participants’ action.

Many of the projects arose due to observations about unsafe road conditions in the participants’ neighborhoods, while others arose due to ideas about a way to improve quality of life on the street. Some were more ambitious, seeking to address or understand citywide topics, while many focused on a very specific intersection or stretch of roadway. Some projects brought to light problems previously unconsidered by local transportation agencies, while others expanded on persistent problems that local planners and engineers were already grappling with. In some cases participants’ actions spurred a local agency to act on the observed issue, either proactively or after some amount of pressure was applied. Others encouraged neighbors and neighborhood groups to band together to address a problem. Some projects were more academic in nature, looking forward and asking big questions about how to address longer-term transportation problems.

Course participants took the time to share their experience with a number of interesting projects. Most respondents seemed to feel they had gained something positive from the project experience, either through actually achieving the project goal or through learning about the process of how to navigate the transportation system and various agencies. For most of these people, the experience seemed to instill a sense of agency (i.e., the knowledge that there was some course of action that could be taken if they observed a problem in the transportation system, had a specific need related to streets or transit, or thought of a way that the system might be improved).

Narratives of a few notable projects wherein the participant played a role are included below. I have left the participants’ descriptions of their project topic and their action/involvement on the issue largely intact, only making a few minor edits for clarity, grammar or to fix typos. Specific identifying information has been removed. Each example is accompanied by a brief description of the participants’ text. Some participants wrote somewhat lengthy descriptions, while others were very brief. These examples were selected to show a variety of ways in which participants were involved; however, there were numerous other interesting examples.

2.3.10.1 **Narratives: Participants work to address specific safety issues**

The participant describes a safety hazard observed at a busy intersection wherein a cyclist proceeding straight through a busy intersection had no dedicated space to wait or maneuver. Although the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) planned a major redesign of the intersection, the participant’s presentation on the hazard to bicyclists helped to prompt a stop-gap fix until the permanent redesign was built.
• *Project Description*: “Dangerous intersection for cyclists: Before the 12th and Burnside/Sandy area was redesigned, it was incredibly dangerous to head north through that intersection as a cyclist - 3 lanes, 2 going straight through, 1 (right lane) turning, nothing marked out for bikes (until you reached the other side of the intersection) so cyclists were pinched from both sides by cars.”

• *Subsequent involvement*: “Due to my presentation, PBOT became aware of problem, told me about the plans to redesign area, but did temp fix (allowed bikes to go straight through in the right lane, added 'except bikes' sign to 'right turn only' sign) which lasted over a year.”

The participant’s project involved the danger posed to cyclists by streetcar tracks, which cause risks including slipping on the tracks or having a tire get stuck in the track groove. The project and class interactions led to the formation of a transportation activism group.

• *Project Description*: “Bicycle/streetcar interactions”

• *Subsequent involvement*: “Yes, I worked on this extensively in succeeding years. The group Active Right of Way was really formed out of a group of us who took the class together in 2009, and we continued to work with the city through 2011 as the new line was constructed. It is still an active issue in Portland bicycle safety.”

2.3.10.2 *Narratives: Participants work with agency staff to tackle common neighborhood needs*

The participant describes how they were able to contact the city and have a potential safety hazard addressed. They point to the connection made with agency staff through the course as a factor.

• *Project Description*: “I looked into a storm drainage which was deep and took up a significant portion of the bike lane on Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy.”

• *Subsequent involvement*: “I followed up with city officials and the problem was taken care. Interestingly, I contacted the hotline first and was told the problem could not be addressed. I then emailed [contact at the Portland Bureau of Transportation], who I met through the course. I do not think if I had taken the course and met [the contact] that the issue would have been addressed as quickly, if at all.”

The participant’s project involved requesting a street closure to hold an event. While this is a short-term outcome, the experience was remembered as successful and likely imbued the participant with a sense that they could navigate bureaucracy to effect change.

• *Project Description*: “Conducting a temporary street closure for a community event.”

• *Subsequent involvement*: “Had successful "Square Dance in the Street" event as part of the Annual Toward Carfree Cities Conference Portland hosted.”

This participant’s project addressed a common concern in many neighborhoods, speeds on nearby streets, and a common challenge in efforts to calm local streets, the need to not impede fire-truck access. This participant was able to work with city staff to overcome these challenges and have speed tables installed.
• **Project Description:** “Get City of Portland approval for a test/demonstration project of fire-truck friendly speed tables on my street (Cornell Road in close-in NW Portland).”

• **Subsequent involvement:** “Worked with City staff to get approval to move the project forward. Six speed tables were installed and still remain in place.”

2.3.10.3 **Narratives: Participant involvement in sustained community effort**

The participant describes how they worked with the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) on a project combining storm water treatment facilities (likely bio-swales and related facilities) with pedestrian and bicycle safety facilities. The example, which highlights a synergy between the two agencies, demonstrates the considerable efforts and level of involvement undertaken by some course participants, including the variety of tasks and details the participant was involved with to see the project through to completion.

• **Project Description:** “I worked on improving pedestrian and bike safety along SE Sandy Blvd between 9th and 8th and Pine and Oak thru grant money received for storm-water water quality facilities.”

• **Subsequent involvement:** “Things I did after the class:
  1) Lobbied city officials to fully fund this project;
  2) Utilized existing contracting tools to fully fund the project design;
  3) Worked with staff from BES and PBOT to develop a final design;
  4) Met with representatives from the freight community to negotiate turning motions;
  5) Presented the project at CEID (Central Eastside Industrial District). Explained how the project would create parking spaces and gained their approval; and,
  6) Shared the design with the Buckman Community Association (local neighborhood association) and thanked them for supporting the project and being instrumental in obtaining the project's initial grant funding.”

The participant describes their involvement in an effort to improve safety on a neighborhood collector in the north Portland neighborhood of St. Johns. The example demonstrates frustrations that can develop when the interest of residents and other road users – freight trucks in this case – come into conflict, with both parties looking to the city.

• **Project Description:** “A wide neighborhood collector running through St Johns was being used by freight trucks as a short-cut - cutting off half of St Johns from our downtown, our library, our community center. Plus, the street has a blind curve [above which 1,000 kids live] and almost no pedestrian crossings. Because of all this, the street repelled pedestrians and businesses from locating there. It was an ugly, dangerous, street holding the whole of St Johns back. After a couple of years waiting for PBOT to act on the promise that they would begin a planning process to change this, and then 1 1/2 years of very difficult negotiating in a stakeholder committee with PBOT, which included mediation - because PBOT was not listening to the community, we finally got the trucks routed onto the truck route, away from this corridor, and have won a $3 million grant to change the street with many pedestrian crossing improvements. PBOT should begin construction in 2016. These changes will change St. Johns. The street will become a true
neighborhood street, businesses will locate there and people will walk there. This is assuming PBOT carries through with all the promises they made in the plan.”

- **Subsequent involvement:** “I was on the stakeholder committee, and I organized the community to advocate for changes in the plan. After community outrage, mediation set up by a city councilor, research that proved PBOT wrong in some of their assessments of what they could/couldn't do in changing the street, the community achieved part of its goals, and will have achieved all if PBOT follows through with the plan that has been accepted for funding through STIP (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program).”

The participant’s project was related to their duties on their neighborhood association Land Use Committee. The project resulted in a number of changes to the streetscape.

- **Project Description:** “Fremont Main Street Transportation and Parking Study. This was a study where I and others from our land use committee engaged stakeholders in the neighborhood and held public open houses.”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “Parking study along NE Fremont; 3 stakeholder meetings; 2 public open houses. Were able to get four crosswalks installed along NE Fremont between NE 41st and NE 51st, lowered the speed limit to 20 mph in this area and influenced PBOT to install angled parking.”

### 2.3.10.4 Narratives: Participant explores bringing innovative ideas to town

The participant describes their project to explore an idea new to Portland, “parklets” – which reallocate 1-2 parking spots to other uses, such as public seating or for outdoor seating for a restaurant or café. The project demonstrates the positive response the participant had from engaging both city staff and businesses in the community, and the contribution of a course project in bringing parklets to Portland.

- **Project Description:** “I looked into bringing parklets to Portland.”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “I was able to talk with more City personnel about the idea, and I engaged a few local businesses to do some weekend demonstration projects and write the City to present business owners’ opinions about why parklets would be an asset to their business and their neighborhoods. A staffer at PBOT championed the idea and moved forward with designing an official city program for it. The program is now called "Street Seats."

The participant describes their feasibility study of introducing a smart phone app to help citizens report small problems they encounter in their neighborhoods throughout the region.

- **Project Description:** “Fixing small problems (potholes etc.) is 100% report driven but reporting it is hard to figure out how to make reports, so I looked at feasibility of a region-wide citizen reporting smartphone app.”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “I have continued to develop the idea with several groups who are interested. And, I follow what's happening with the City of Portland's more limited but still useful app. A real solution hasn't happened... yet”
2.3.10.5 **Narratives: Research-based projects**

The participant’s research-focused project with grand aspirations sought to assess whether an alternative fuel could meet long-term energy needs.

- **Project Description:** “Cost of biofuels, and if bio-fuels could be used to fuel all of our transportation needs.”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “The conclusion from my study is that we do not have enough biofuels for all the energy we use on a daily basis. Our consumption of energy (coal/oil) is much greater than what we can get from growing as crops. Any mine has a finite limit, and thus we are doomed as a species when we run out of coal/oil. We are already running out of oil- the era of cheap oil is over. Now for more expensive and dangerous oil-fracking and arctic drilling- which will last us 50 years. Then 300 more years till all the coal/mountain top removal. We humans are quite dumb as a species, and have artificially bloated our population from mining cheap energy. When we are out of energy, our population will come down.”

This participant’s project undertook to understand the economic impact of bicycling on a community.

- **Project Description:** “I called it "BOD" (Bike Oriented Development) - looking more generally at how that would affect the built environment around bike corridors. Then I applied it to a specific location - an area where all bikers from NE Portland are funneled across the Broadway Bridge. I wanted to see what may be needed, what could be done, and why this may be different from traditional TOD. Certainly it is very different!”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “No specific follow up. I work in this field so I'm somewhat in touch with similar issues often.”

2.3.10.6 **Narratives: Projects without successful outcomes**

Not all projects described resulted in successful outcomes. The following examples include participants who were not able to implement the changes they sought through their project.

In this example, the participant suggested solutions to a city staff member, who explained the “fallacies” of the suggested approach.

- **Project Description:** “I addressed a need for traffic calming on a street in our neighborhood.”
- **Subsequent involvement:** “I talked with someone from the City of Portland, who talked me through the fallacies of the suggested solutions. I took the information back to the neighborhood association. A year later I moved to another state so I'm not sure of the outcome, if any.”

The prior example seemed to involve the participant learning about the challenges of attempts to address a certain problem. In this example, the participant clearly was left discouraged by their experience.

- **Project Description:** “Local traffic control / speeding, lack of funds to address local solution.”
• **Subsequent involvement:** “My engagement in the issue taught me the city didn't think it was an issue.”

Another example of a participant feeling discouraged.

• **Project Description:** “Poor pedestrian crossings on SE Grand between Belmont and Burnside.”
• **Subsequent involvement:** “The course taught me the futility of my project.”

This participant’s project explored ways to slow traffic on a neighborhood main street in southeast Portland. Although the specific proposals were never constructed, the project did result in the participant getting further involved in local issues by joining their neighborhood association’s Land Use and Transportation Committee, and navigating the process of including their ideas in grant proposals. These skills, while perhaps not fruitful in this case, may be valuable in subsequent neighborhood efforts.

• **Project Description:** “Slow Down Stark was my project title. This focused on looking at Stark Street from SE 82nd Ave to SE 76th Ave as a new and budding neighborhood community that needed to reevaluate the street needs from one as a thoroughfare to one as a pedestrian rich, walkable area for business and pleasure.”
• **Subsequent involvement:** “I continued work, indirectly, by joining the Montavilla Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee. Some of my ideas were proposed to bundle in with different grant projects but none of them came to be actually, physically constructed projects.”

This project sought to address a perceived inadequacy of signage on the downtown Portland Transit Mall, a couplet of streets with dedicated bus and light rail lanes. The participant’s frustration in this case stems from a sense that decision-makers were not interested in addressing the confusion of motorists on the mall.

• **Project Description:** “The Portland Transit Mall has many operational issues. Signage is confusing for drivers, who routinely drive in the bus- and train-only lanes. Lane markings ("Bus Only") are only at the beginning of every block, thus drivers can turn onto the mall and into the prohibited lanes without noticing. The divider between the transit lanes and the car/bike lane is marked with small protrusions (that have noticeably weathered down by now) leading to more confusion for car drivers where they should not cross. Car drivers and tourists in particular still try to drive across the tracks to make right turns on the mall. Overall these issues lead to confusion, accidents and near-accidents, and noise pollution from the buses and trains who try to "honk" cars out of the way.”
• **Subsequent involvement:** “[The course instructor] gave me the contact info for the mall but ultimately the city of Portland does not see this as a problem. The mall has won design awards (and to be fair, it does look pretty) but that's largely prioritizing form over function. The mall has been open for 5 years now and every private auto driver has difficulty driving on it, frequently blocking trains, cutting off buses, and nearly causing accidents. Many of my contacts from TriMet work on the mall in some capacity (some operating vehicles, others as TriMet supervisors) and they all confirm that issues are ongoing but there is no support from the city to address them - additional or different signage would be seen as "ruining the look of the mall".”
3.0  KEY FINDINGS FROM THE CASE STUDY

3.1  WHO IS TAKING THE CLASS?

Participants in the Portland Traffic and Transportation course were:

- Much more likely to be bicyclists and much less likely to be motorists than the population of Portland;
- Age and gender splits were about in line with the population of Portland;
- More likely to be white than the population of Portland; and,
- More highly educated than average in the population of Portland.

3.2  WHY ARE THEY TAKING THE CLASS?

Participants are finding out about the class through a wide variety of sources, suggesting that there is good word of mouth around Portland about the class. Over a quarter of participants found out about the class from a friend, and another sixth found out via a blog or listserv. However, official information channels are also important, with neighborhood associations and city sources combining for over a quarter of participants.

Decisions to enroll were made for a variety of reasons, but over half the participants cited personal enrichment as a main reason. Other important reasons were interest in becoming involved in transportation decisions, for professional enrichment, and to better advocate for transportation improvements.

3.3  EXPERIENCE TAKING THE COURSE

The special guest presentations were viewed as the most valuable course component overall. This was followed by the teaching of the course instructor, site visits, work on the course project, and the opportunity to interact with course presenters and classmates.

Respondents largely felt that the course was valuable in terms of personal self-enrichment, and that they gained a solid understanding of the evolution of the transportation system over time, the
roles of different agencies involved in transportation, and urban design factors that influence transportation.

Asked to explain the most important thing they learned in the course, most described gaining an understanding of topics such as the context of the Portland transportation system (40%); learning about the transportation policy and budget process (29%); agency roles (25%); and planner roles (14%). Just under a quarter described learning about how to participate in the transportation decision-making process as the most important thing they learned.

3.4 SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO THE COURSE

Most participants were happy with the general layout of the course content. Asked if the course should be revised to include more or less focus on certain topics, the topics on which most people would like to see a greater focus included factors that agencies consider when making decisions about transportation issues and the available tools that agencies can implement to address transportation and traffic issues. These were followed closely by methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system and who to contact with concerns about transportation issues in their neighborhood. Women and bicycle commuters were more interested in course revisions that would place greater focus on effectively advocating for transportation changes (such as collecting evidence or data to strengthen a request or argument about a transportation concern; giving testimony or framing an argument to effectively be heard by decision-makers; methods of engaging neighbors/friends around an issue; and methods of advocating for improvement to the transportation system).

3.5 COURSE GRADUATES AND INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSPORTATION DECISION-MAKING

Participants were asking how frequently they are involved in various forms of community transportation activities, from attending neighborhood meetings to working on campaigns addressing transportation concerns. Across a wide variety of measures, course graduates report increasing their participation in community transportation activities dramatically from prior to taking the course. Participant involvement since taking the course is also considerably higher than most Americans report being involved in comparable activities. This does not show that there is a causal link between taking the class and increased involvement – although the course did lead to increased civic participation on transportation issues for some participants (some participants’ narrative descriptions of the impact of the course confirms this), there are likely many participants who took the course because they were already inclined to increase their involvement. However, the course appears to have given them important knowledge about the transportation system and, for some participants, important information and connections to help them become involved in pushing for transportation improvements.
3.6 PARTICIPANTS’ EXPERIENCES WITH COURSE PROJECT

The participants’ descriptions of their course projects demonstrate a variety of different types of projects undertaken and a variety of experiences during and after the project. A few key findings from the project narratives are:

- Each participant’s experience as an individual user of the transportation system is important. No matter how competent transportation agency staff may be, and no matter their number, they cannot know or anticipate each safety problem, inefficiency or unmet need of systems users. Many participants observed and acted upon these types of problems that might have gone unnoticed, unremarked upon, and/or unacted upon otherwise.
- Even in cases where agency staff was previously aware of a problem or need, the interaction between citizen and agency can foster a sense of agency in the citizen and validate the duty of the agency staff to serve the public good.
- The perseverance and dedication displayed by many course participants in organizing allies and petitioning for improvements to the transportation system is impressive, and suggests at a potential latent passion for involvement in transportation issues that the course may have helped actualize.
- There are many small ways in which citizen ideas can make a city more vibrant and fun, if citizens have a means of pursuing their ideas (and have a sense that their goal is achievable).
- The ways in which participants remember and tell their stories provides insight into what was important to them about the experience. For some people, their narrative is focused on the intricate details of a specific safety problem, while others focus much more on their process of tackling the problem, such as who they met with, who was involved in the decision-making, and what actions were taken.

Of course, there were also participants who felt frustrated by their experiences. These frustrations generally came about when they encountered a roadblock in their effort to address the problem presented by their project. The roadblocks were often described as agencies or individuals in those agencies who were not responsive to their concerns, either because they were not reachable, or because they did not think there was an actionable step to be taken. It’s worth noting here that a guiding principle of the course, as explained by the instructor, was that participants would be rebuffed (and likely, more than once) in their efforts to reach out to agency staff and to address these problems, and that they would have to accept that and try again. In theory that may be an easy lesson, but in practice, it left some participants feeling disempowered. This challenge should be a cautionary tale, and it is one that any such course will have to work hard to overcome.
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1. CITIZEN TRANSPORTATION ACADEMY

The Citizen Transportation Academy is course curriculum that harnesses the knowledge, technical expertise and passions of practicing transportation professionals in a city to immerse a cohort of interested and dedicated community members in transportation issues over the course of two to three months. In this context, a “citizen” is “a person who lives in a particular place” or “an inhabitant of a city or town” (Merriam-Webster). The course is designed to provide course participants with:

- A basic technical understanding of how the city’s transportation system operates on a daily basis, along with what agencies and policies play a role in the system’s development and operation.
- The opportunity to meet, learn from and ask questions of the individuals who lead and staff local transportation agencies.
- The opportunity to interact with other citizens who have an interest in transportation issues.
- Course lectures and a course assignment that help the participant understand the role and impact they have as a citizen, including how to interact with transportation agencies and how to engage fellow citizens around community transportation needs.

The Citizen Transportation Academy curriculum is based on the Portland Traffic and Transportation course. Citizen planning academy courses in cities around the country are also good models to look to for how to structure and operate such a course. However, the nature of the transportation course is that it goes into much greater depth on a specific topic, allowing the participant to go deeper into transportation history and technical discussions and develop a greater understanding of the agencies and policies involved.

Key course elements include:

- A series of guest lectures from city transportation leaders, including city commissioners, transportation agency directors and managers, and other key transportation decision-makers;
- A tour of the city to gain a practical, visual impact of transportation decisions; and,
- A problem-solving assignment that asks students to identify a transportation problem and, through a series of exercises, propose a solution to the problem (as well as to explain why the solution may or may not work).

The course is jointly administered by the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and Portland State University (PSU) in an effort to meld the knowledge and experience of professional transportation agency staff with the learning environment of the university. A PBOT employee serves as a course organizer, arranging logistics and promoting the course. A course instructor is contracted to manage the course and arrange guest speakers. PSU also provides a graduate student employee to manage student participation in the class.
2. IMPLEMENTATION WISDOM FROM THE PORTLAND COURSE INSTRUCTOR

Feedback from the Portland Traffic and Transportation course instructor with over two decades experience teaching the class yielded a number of important insights for how to produce a successful course.

- **Understand the past:** Knowing how the transportation system came about can put the current state of things into context and help avoid making the same mistakes again. The history also can convey that the system’s development is not a fight between the city and the neighborhood, but rather a longstanding conversation about how the system works and develops.

- **Technical nature of transportation:** Transportation is a unique topic wherein technical understanding is very important and sometimes facts can be counterintuitive (as in the example of faster traffic speed limits sometimes resulting in lower vehicle throughput). Transportation is a field wherein knowing the facts and having access to the information in a local context is very important because it’s usually not really possible to communicate in abstract terms.

- **Diversity of student interests:** Different course participants will bring different interests, passions and approaches. For example, in the Portland course, the PSU students tend to bring more of an academic and research approach to the class (and subsequently to their questions in lectures and to their course project), while neighborhood advocates bring more community-based knowledge and interest in processes needed to get things done in their neighborhood.

- **Value of the university setting:** The university setting has been invaluable to the success of the Portland Traffic and Transportation course because it brings a learning atmosphere to the process, wherein respect is accorded. It doesn’t feel like a town hall meeting where people are there to push an agenda and agency staff are expected to tow the agency line. Rather, the university setting provides a neutral setting in which agendas are set aside in the interest of learning. If the class were held at PBOT’s offices, the neutral setting and the benefit that it imparts could be jeopardized.

- **Participation of agency leaders:** It’s important that the top talent in the city must participate by giving course lectures (for example, division managers, agency directors and commissioners, etc.). By having top leadership participate, this gives participants access to the people making the decisions, along with top expertise in engineering and the best information on the city’s processes.

- **Top-level support from city leaders:** One key element to getting top talent to participate is having steady support from the city and transportation agencies.
3. FEEDBACK FROM COURSE GRADUATES

Feedback received from graduates of the Portland Traffic and Transportation course, along with an analysis of survey responses, highlight a few key findings:

- **Guest lectures are the most popular course element:** Guest lectures (and access to people making local transportation decisions) are viewed as the most important and valuable course elements. This highlights the importance of getting excellent guest presenters as a foundational element of the course.

- **Understanding who does what in transportation:** Participants are very interested in understanding the roles of the different agencies working in the transportation landscape, what the agencies’ fiscal and policy constraints are, and what tools are and are not available to them. People really want to understand how things get done and what is and is not possible.

- **Understanding how to get involved:** Many people are participating because they want to know how they can be involved (at various levels) in transportation decision-making in their community. There is an interest in learning how to advocate within the transportation system for their community.

- **Harnessing what participants bring to the class and community:** There is an incredible amount of passion, energy and experience in the community. The course is an excellent way to provide residents with knowledge they might not get anywhere else, and to empower them to be effective citizens.
4. FEEDBACK FROM EXPERTS IN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Conversations with a number of experts from around the country on issues of citizen involvement and public participation in civic activity and decision-making highlighted a number of important factors that need to be considered when implementing the Citizen Transportation Academy.

- **Mutual understanding:** There are many constraints on planners and agencies, but city staff are not always good at making those constraints known to community members. The constraints on the planner or agency may include fiscal constraints; engineering constraints; legislative or legal constraints; and bureaucratic constraints including internal agency dynamics, concerns about image and perception, or a fear that engaging citizens/advocates will be complicated. A result of this is that, in some cases, citizens may think their concerns are not being heard or are simply being ignored, and that the citizen and planner are not able to have an open conversation about how to create a change. There is a need on both the part of the agency staff and the citizen to better understand one another.

- **Technical knowledge:** Echoing some of the reasons cited for the founding of the course - transportation gets complicated fast because of varying levels of authority, different agencies, overlapping jurisdictions and blurred distinctions between roles. Learning how to navigate these different layers is very important.

- **Understanding systems:** Citizens need to learn to think in terms of systems and the effect that one change may have on other interrelated components within the transportation system or outside of it. There are lots of consequences that planners have to consider and that a citizen advocate needs to understand in order to make the most effective and convincing argument for a proposed improvement.

- **Providing a boost, not a burden:** One internal challenge that a local jurisdiction may need to acknowledge and overcome when implementing the Citizen Transportation Academy is that some agencies and staff will view empowering residents as something that will add extra work to their load (e.g., if the course results in more people contacting city staff). However, the goal should be improving the city’s transportation overall, and in most cases, citizen involvement is a cheap way to have a transportation system that serves the community better.

- **Citizen agency and trust:** Residents must have the confidence that if they engage in the transportation decision-making process, they will be heard and have some influence. For many residents, particularly in underserved communities, there is a sense that their individual action won’t have any impact on community decision-making activities and won’t have any effect on community outcomes. For this reason, it is important to imbue
in citizens a sense of agency and the knowledge that they can act, and if they do so, that they will be heard. This is a hard task to achieve, and requires that citizens know how to become involved and what tools are available to them. These things can be taught in the course. However, particularly in communities where their voices haven’t been heard in the past, the process will take longer. A few things to keep in mind related to this:

- In building a sense of agency among community members, it’s important not to ignore or downplay successes, even if they are small.
- However, as is taught in the Portland Traffic and Transportation course, participants will likely encounter their fair share of “no” responses from city staff, and must be prepared to deal with that.

**Accountability:** Getting community residents involved in the course and in local transportation issues is good because it makes people more invested and gives them the right (and impetus) to demand accountability.

**Dialogue and active listening:** The course should promote dialogue and active listening. Many people assume they are right once they have an idea and do not truly listen after that. Other people will shut down if you just push your agenda and ideas all the time without listening to what other people around you (agency staff or other community members) want or believe. Success, even in negotiation, requires listening skills.

**In touch with the community:** In order for a Citizen Transportation Academy course to be successful, it will be important to know the community. In working to set up a local course, work with community members to understand their past experience with government and transportation planning, along with the community’s needs and wants.

- To be effective in pushing for positive improvement on community transportation issues, students will need both process knowledge (e.g., understanding how the transportation system works and where citizens can get involved) and community knowledge. They must know how a project affects them and their community AND must know how to do something about it.
- Courses should use real examples from the community in order to demonstrate the value of what community members can achieve.

**Overcoming barriers to participation:** Low-income communities present a special challenge because often basic needs, like long work hours and taking care of kids, come first and people don’t have time to get involved. Further, in some communities they may have much further to travel to get to a central meeting location for a course. Organizers may consider locating courses close to the communities in which people live, and providing food and child care if the course is in the evening. Language challenges may also be a considerable barrier.
• **Building trust:** Not only do underrepresented groups have difficulty accessing government, but in many cases they are distrustful of government. The course offers an opportunity to rebuild trust, but must take the responsibility to do so seriously.

• **Teaching skills for effective engagement:** Most community members haven’t had exposure to many of the skills necessary to advocate for improvements to the transportation system. Among these skills and experiences are giving effective testimony about a problem/need or collecting data to demonstrate the problem, organizing with fellow community members and getting a message out to the community, and numerous other skills.
5. WHO WILL PARTICIPATE

There are many people with a variety of interests who may be interested in learning more about their local transportation system. The course functions best when it is inclusive:

- Is it for advocates? Yes!
- Is it for concerned citizens? Yes!
- Is it for those curious about transportation? Yes!
- Is it for people working in transportation who want more information? Yes!
- Do you need to commit to being there and interested? Yes!

That last point is an important one because a 10-week course requires a level of commitment from the student that they want to be there.
6. OPERATING PRINCIPLES

The following are a set of operating principles to be successful in developing a Citizen Transportation Academy in your city:

- **Find a champion:** The Academy will need someone willing to fight to get funding to get the class off the ground, to rally city and agency leadership to support the class and to promote the class in the community. This may or may not be the course instructor, and could be a small coalition of champions as well.

- **Recruit top agency staff to participate:** It will be important to have students interact with the people who have the experience and are making the decisions on transportation topics in the city. These should be agency and department leaders, and should be willing to take the time to make their presentations interesting and engaging.

- **Foster communication between community members and agency staff:** The course should help citizens and city staff to develop a common language of understanding around transportation issues. This requires citizens to learn some technical aspects about transportation and how decisions are made, but also for staff to be open, engaged and available to students.

- **Develop a sense of agency in course participants:** An important lesson for students is not only how to get involved in transportation decision-making, but also that they can have an impact. This lesson is sensitive because it requires that students be prepared for inevitable frustrations (they won’t always, or even usually, get all the change they want, and they’ll be told “no” often). It also requires that cities and agencies have systems that respect citizen participation, and in which there are ways for citizens and communities to shape transportation decisions and improvements. The course assignment should promote this principle.

- **Establish a neutral setting:** A university offers an academic setting that allows community members and city staff to meet and talk on neutral ground. It is important that city staff, decision-makers and community members are able to openly express their own opinions in the course setting. The open atmosphere of a university allows clear and open communication. It also allows participation from university students in transportation-related fields, in addition to community members.

- **Establish an alumni network:** The Academy offers many students an opportunity to connect with other like-minded citizens with an interest in improving transportation in local communities. Develop an alumni network with regular opportunities for alumni to share information about what they are working on in their communities and meet new graduates. The network could take the form of an email listserv, happy hours, or other types of activities that connect course graduates.
7. CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 COURSE CHECKLIST

Once you decide to carry out a Citizen Transportation Academy in your city, you’ll need to undertake several tasks:

- **Develop champions of the course**: Course champions should be passionate about transportation and harnessing the knowledge, energy and interest of citizens in the community. They should be able to rally support around the course, help secure commitments from city transportation leaders to participate (and to have their agency leadership participate as well), and have a long-term commitment to promoting the goals of the course.

- **Find the course instructor**: The course instructor should also be a champion of the course. They should have a deep understanding of transportation issues and players in the city, and have the time to dedicate to teaching, organizing guest lectures and helping develop course materials.

- **Find presenters**: Secure commitment from local transportation leaders to present on the key topics identified in the session’s list. Assign presentation topics in coordination with the presenters, provide them with the presentation template, and make sure they are able to put together presentations by the session date. In addition to a lecture format, consider incorporating panel presentations and discussions which may help to elucidate multiple angles of complicated agency operations.

- **Decide on a budget**: Budget your course costs and secure funding. You will also have to determine how/if you will charge for the course, and what will be included in the course (such as meals, child care, etc.).

- **Arrange a meeting time and location**: Generally, midweek evenings will work best for the greatest number of people. In securing a classroom, remember to try to find a neutral location, such as a university or community classroom.

- **Find a panel**: Identify a presentation panel for course participants and schedule a final presentation time.

- **Develop course materials**: Course materials will need to be developed specific to the city. These include a local transportation resource list/guide (to identify local transportation resources, such as plans, reports, histories or other documents that can help students to understand the local transportation system), and the course syllabus.

- **Recruit students**: Identify how you will advertise the course to get your intended enrollment.
7.2 COST

Cost to Implement: The cost of citizen academy courses has been shown to be relatively modest. A survey of 74 municipalities offering citizen leadership academies found that the average cost to hold the classes was around $2,000, though this did not include staff time (Huggins, 2014). The Portland Traffic and Transportation course costs PBOT about $6,500-8,000 per year factoring in instructor fees and administrative costs, while PSU provides the meeting room.

Cost to Participants: The cost to students should be as affordable as possible. The cost structure also should offer the opportunity to incentivize students to attend the bulk of the classes. For example, Portland offers scholarships to students that commit to attending 80% of the classes.

7.3 GETTING MORE VALUE OUT OF THE COURSE

Promote student work: One way to promote student work while getting the word out about the class is to work with local journalists, bloggers or city staff to document and share stories about the project students have been working on. This can be an exciting opportunity for students to show what they’ve achieved or to highlight an issue they want more people to hear about. At the same time, it can show the value of the course and advertise for future courses.

Develop alumni networks: Alumni and current students of the Citizen Transportation Academy course share similar interests in transportation. Additionally, many students may be participating in the course because they want to connect and network with other like-minded citizens. Consider inviting course alumni to attend student presentations or to celebrate at a reception or happy hour afterward. Encourage students to develop an alumni listserv to keep each informed about transportation-related news, events and campaigns.

Coordinate with a Citizen Planning Academy: A Citizen Transportation Academy could be a good synergistic fit with a Citizen Planning Academy for cities that have one. The two courses could be offered in alternative seasons (e.g., one in the spring and the other in the fall), and offer students the opportunity to go into greater depth on transportation topics if they so choose. Each course could promote the other and further develop students’ civic and technical knowledge and skills.

Maximize relationships with university or college partners: A strong relationship with a college or university can offer many advantages for the Citizen Transportation Academy. As mentioned earlier, the neutral academic setting of the university can serve to moderate tensions between citizens and agency staff (which may exist in agency public meetings). The relationship can offer the university the opportunity to share topical expertise with citizens through professors or researchers presenting alongside agency staff. The university may gain future students if course participants decide they want to pursue further studies in the area. Some colleges or universities may also consider offering credit for the course, or otherwise incorporating elements of the course into a degree program or capstone.
7.4 EVALUATING AND IMPROVING THE COURSE

The course instructor should always look for ways to strengthen the course from one year to the next. Course evaluation should be completed by students at the end of each year to understand what is working well and what needs improvement. These evaluations may be shared with presenters to help them and motivate them to improve their presentations.
8. TIPS FOR COURSE ORGANIZERS, INSTRUCTORS AND PRESENTERS

8.1 COURSE ORGANIZER

As the course organizer, your role is to handle the logistics of the course, from handling any paperwork and payment needs, organizing and securing a meeting location, recruiting students, and making sure that the instructor has the information and material they need.

8.2 COURSE INSTRUCTOR

As the instructor of the Citizen Transportation Academy, you have several important responsibilities, including:

- Stay focused on presentation quality. Make sure presentations are of a high level of professional quality.
  - In a sense, this is a “great lecture series,” and it’s your responsibility to make the presentations great.
  - Have all presenters start their presentation by succinctly stating what exactly their department, agency or group does. This helps students to wrap their heads around the different roles in government and what the specific responsibilities are.
- Guide students through the project process.
- Be capable of running a tour / onsite experience for students.
- Be willing and able to advocate for the best interest of the class, and push partners (transportation agency, university, etc.) to fulfill their obligations.

8.3 GUEST PRESENTERS

At its core, the Citizen Transportation Academy should be a sort of “great lecture series” with top-quality and experienced transportation leaders. Presenters should:

- Start their presentation by very succinctly stating what exactly their department/agency/group does. This helps students wrap their heads around the different roles in government and what the specific responsibilities are.
- Prepare their presentation in advance, and share their presentation (or their plans) with the course instructor for feedback on how to best engage students.
- Update and improve presentations annually. Allowing for a feedback mechanism (e.g., a course survey during the final class) can be a good vehicle for constructive feedback for both presenters and the course instructor.
9. COURSE ASSIGNMENT

The course assignment is designed to achieve a few goals. These include having the student observe how transportation works (or doesn’t) in their community, and identify a transportation problem or issue (no matter how big or small), collect information about the identified issue, and interact with city staff regarding the concern. Finally, students are expected to propose a solution and identify whether their proposed solution can or will work. The suggested assignment steps are also included in the course session pages. Note that allowing students to form groups for the course assignment should be considered, as it may allow for more in-depth projects.

**Assignment for week 2:** Identify a transportation-related problem or issue that you’ve observed in your community or city. This could be a safety problem, inefficiency or missed opportunity.

**Assignment for week 3:** Devise and implement an observation / data collection scheme to obtain more information and insight into the problem or issue you have identified. In-person observation is preferred, but interviews with people who have experienced the problem or research into how other communities have handled the problem may also be used.

**Assignment for week 4:** Continue observation / data collection scheme if more time is needed. Alternatively explore case studies in course-suggested readings for communities that have dealt with similar problems / issues.

**Assignment for week 5:** Propose a solution to your observed problem or issue. Be prepared to briefly discuss your proposed solution.

**Assignment for week 6:** Talk to someone at a relevant transportation-related agency about your observed problem or issue. Try to get insight into why the problem exists and what challenges your solution might have.

**Assignment for week 7:** In small groups of 2-3 students in class, discuss your observed issue/problem, proposed solution and experience with city agencies. Identify potential next steps.

**Assignment for week 8:** Work on presentation of your transportation issue/problem and proposed solution.

**Assignment for week 9:** Prepare a 3-5 minute presentation on your transportation issue/problem, proposed solution, and why your solution will or will not work.
10. PROPOSED COURSE SESSIONS

The course is designed to be about transportation in a local place. Because of this, the sessions will need to be adapted to the local context. In the interest of including the most engaging and experienced city leaders and agency staff, the suggested sessions should only be used as a rough guide. The interest and expertise of presenters should take precedence over strict adherence to a recommended session topic.

The course sessions are structured to provide students with a mix of:

- **High-level transportation understanding** and background (Session 1 on History, Session 2 on Major Issues and Decisions, and Session 3 on Planning for Transportation);

- An introduction to **top-level city leadership and their decision-making processes** (Session 2 on Major Issues and Decisions);

- **On-the-ground experience with transportation issues** (Site Visits and course assignment);

- A solid understanding of the **challenges, tools and approaches taken by specific agencies and staff working in transportation** (Session 5 on Transit, Session 6 on the Department of Transportation, and Session 7 on Active Transportation);

- Information about **how to be involved in the transportation process** (course assignment, each agency/department session, and Session 8 specifically on how to be involved in transportation decision-making); and

- The understanding that, **as a citizen of the city, they should be involved** in order to improve transportation in their community (course assignment, Session 8 on how to be involved, and course presentations).

Suggested readings and assignments for the next week are listed at the end of each session’s overview.
Session 1: History of Transportation Shaping the City

Recommended presenter: City planner or course instructor

Possible session topics:

- Role of transportation and geography in city location
- Street layout
  - What type of layout (e.g., grid, etc.)?
  - What type of hierarchy was built into the system (e.g., main streets, arterials, alleys, etc.)?
  - What are the block lengths/sizes? Why were these sizes chosen?
- Land development and influence on transportation
  - Where are job-dense neighborhoods? Has that changed over time?
  - Where has residential development focused? Has that changed over time?
  - Demographics, communities and transportation – where have communities of different ethnic or racial backgrounds lived? Different income levels? How have those differences influenced transportation?
- Early public transportation
  - What did it connect and why?
  - What type of transit and why?
  - What route/streets did it travel and why?
- Highway/freeway influence on city development
  - Were the highways/freeways built before or after the city was originally laid out?
  - If after, how did their construction change the city?
- Current public transportation system
  - When was it planned?
  - How was it funded?
  - What challenges were encountered during construction?

Suggested reading for next week:
1) National League of Cities - “Understanding Urban Transportation Systems”
2) City of Seattle – “Vision Zero plan” or alternate Vision Zero plan
3) Local transportation system history document, if available

Assignment for next week: Identify a transportation-related problem or issue that you’ve observed in your community or city. This could be a safety problem, inefficiency or missed opportunity.
Session 2a: Major Issues and Decisions: Major Issues Facing the Transportation Department

**Recommended presenter:** Transportation department director

**Possible session topics:**

- Upcoming challenges for transportation in the city, and how the department of transportation expects to address the challenges.
- Factors that the department must consider when making decisions, including policy and fiscal opportunities and constraints.
- The available tools the department can use to address transportation and traffic issues.

Session 2b: Major Issues and Decisions: Major Decision Points in the City Transportation History

**Recommended presenter:** City commissioner or other leader involved in transportation policy

**Possible session topics:**

- Major decision points that shaped the current transportation system
- How those decisions were made, both in terms of process and content
  - Who were the key decision-makers? What information did they have? What resources were they working with?
  - How was the public involved in the decision?
- How the city would have been different if a different decision had been made

**Suggested reading for next week:**

1) City/regional transportation plan overview document, if available

**Assignment for next week:** Devise and implement an observation / data collection scheme to obtain more information and insight into the problem or issue you have identified. In-person observation is preferred, but interviews with people who have experienced the problem or research into how other communities have handled the problem may also be used.
Session 3a: Planning for Transportation: Overview of the Regional Transportation Plan

**Recommended presenter:** Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) director or planner

**Possible session topics:**
- Benefits and limitations of regional transportation planning
- Factors considered include:
  - Travel demand
  - Relationships of modes
- Coordination process between cities and entities in the region

Session 3b: Planning for Transportation: City Transportation Plans

**Recommended presenter:** Planning or transportation department planner

**Possible session topics:**
- Plans that affect transportation
- Comprehensive Plan
- Transportation System Plan
- How do land use plans affect transportation?

**Suggested reading:**
1) Local information related to site visit locations and project, if available

**Assignment for next week:** Continue observation / data collection scheme if more time is needed. Alternatively explore case studies in course-suggested readings for communities that have dealt with similar problems / issues.
Session 4: Class Field Trip and Site Visits

Site visit leader: Course instructor

Possible site visit locations and topics:
- Recent street redesigns or infrastructure improvements
- Problem areas
- Transit-oriented development
- Visit sites of problem areas identified by class members

Suggested reading for next week:
1) Review local transportation map and identify how you would travel from your home to work, to downtown, to a grocery store, to a restaurant, to a library, and to the airport using public transit

Assignment for next week: Propose a solution to your observed problem or issue. Be prepared to briefly discuss your proposed solution.
Session 5: Transit Agency: Analysis and Planning

**Recommended presenter:** Transit agency director or planner

**Possible session topics:**
- Transit types in the city – which and why?
- Planning to identify primary transit networks
- Integration of transportation and land use
- How is transit paid for in the region? What are the long-term forecasts for the funding stream?
- What capital investments in transit are needed and what investments are planned? How do regional entities coordinate on transit planning?

**Suggested reading for next week:**
1) Schlossberg et al, “Rethinking Streets,” especially pages 5-10, and then an additional 3-4 case studies (each is a quick read with lots of visuals).

**Assignment for next week:** Talk to someone at a relevant transportation-related agency about your observed problem or issue. Try to get insight into why the problem exists and what challenges your solution might have.
Session 6a: Transportation Department: Planning and Services

Recommended presenter: City transportation planner

Possible session topics:
- Travel demand management
- Right-of-way management
- Coordination with planning department and transit agency
- Role of freight in the transportation system
- Major projects identification and planning
- Streetscape redesigns

Session 6b: Transportation Department: Engineering and Systems

Recommended presenter: City transportation engineer

Possible session topics:
- The systems used to manage city transportation
  - Signals
  - Detectors
  - Data management
- City’s role in parking management

Suggested reading for next week:

Assignment for next week: In small groups of 2-3 students in class, discuss your observed issue/problem, proposed solution and experience with city agencies. Identify potential next steps.
Session 7a: Active Transportation: Bicycling in the City

Recommended presenter: Bicycle coordinator

Possible session topics:

- Benefits and barriers to cycling
- Accomplishments achieved in improving the city for bicycling
- Challenges and needs for improving the city for bicycling
- New or planned bicycling facilities – what been done and what’s needed?
- Policies and programs for encouraging cycling – what been done and what’s needed?
  - Encouragement; Education; Enforcement; Evaluation
- Funding for bicycle projects
- Goals for bicycling in the city

Session 7b: Active Transportation: Walking in the City

Recommended presenter: Pedestrian coordinator

Possible session topics:

- Everyone is a pedestrian
- Interaction with other modes
- Universal design – designing for children, adults, the elderly, etc.
- Role of walking on health and urban vitality
- Efforts to improve the safety at crossings, schools, etc.
  - Benefits of reduced crossing distances and to achieve this goal
  - Those that have been built (including any results)
  - Those that need to be built

Suggested reading for next week:

1) Arnstein – “A Ladder of Citizen Participation”
3) Transportation Alternatives – “Neighborhood Traffic Monitoring Toolkit”

Assignment for next week: Work on presentation of your transportation issue/problem and proposed solution.
Session 8a: How to be Involved in Transportation Decision-making: The Role of Neighborhood Associations, Community Boards or Other Local Community Governance Entity

**Recommended presenter:** Neighborhood association (NA) or community board (CB) transportation chair/liaison

**Possible session topics:**
- What type of transportation concerns do NAs or CBs deal with?
- What are the local mechanisms to handle concerns?
- Where should residents take concerns?
- How can residents get involved in influencing transportation decision-making through NAs or CBs?

Session 8b: How to be Involved in Transportation Decision-making: Transportation Advocacy and Campaigns

**Recommended presenter:** Transportation advocacy group representative

**Possible session topics:**
- Why campaign for a transportation issue?
- What type of evidence is needed to demonstrate a problem, and how do you collect evidence?

**Assignment for next week:** Prepare a 3-5 minute presentation on your transportation issue/problem, proposed solution, and why your solution will or will not work.
Session 9: Student Classroom Presentations

_Recommended presenter:_ Students

_Student presentations on projects:_
- Classroom discussion on problems identified by students, their proposed plan to address the problem, and their experience navigating the transportation system to address the problem
- Effective methods employed to engage agency staff
- Class discussion/reflection on course project process

Session 10: Student Presentations to Panel of City Transportation Leaders

_Recommended presenter:_ Selected student projects

_Student presentations on projects:_
- Students ideas and proposals
- Challenges encountered along the way
The following readings offer a variety of opportunities for interested students to delve into greater depth on the topics covered in the course. The readings have been selected to provide general context and applications to interested citizens. Some are more applied and others more theoretical. Some cover broad topic areas, while others focus on specific transportation subareas. An effort has been made to select electronic resources available to freely download or print.

Course instructors should also work to include relevant local information in the suggested readings, including information about local development, transportation history and navigating local agencies, if available.

---

**THE ROLE OF THE STREET**


For those interested in a more theoretical overview of the function of the street, this offers a discussion of the important players (including advocacy and professional organizations) who are involved in the discussion and negotiation about the meaning of the street as a place. The article discusses the key elements that make up the street, and how each element contributes to the overall experience of the street. The article also addresses key thinkers and works in the discussion of the street, and provides many good jumping-off points for people wishing to delve into great depth on these topics.

A free PDF download of the book “Urban Design: Tools & Resources for the Planning Practitioner” is available from Routledge Publishing:

http://www.routledge.com/planning/articles/download_urban_design_tools_resources_for_the_planning_practitioner/
or

http://tandf.msgfocus.com/k/Tandf/freebook_urban_design_tools_resources_for_the_professional_practitioner

---

**READINGS ON TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS**

National League of Cities - “Understanding Urban Transportation Systems” (2011)

This report, subtitled “An Action Guide for City Leaders,” seeks “to provide a broad overview of the causes of urban transportation problems, and of the implications for finding good solutions. It addresses five big issues: The role of the public sector in urban
surface transportation; Characteristics of the existing urban transportation system; How the urban transportation system is likely to change in the future; Characteristics of the process through which transportation policy is made; and Actions city leaders might take.” Although it is designed for top-level decision-makers, it provides a concise overview of urban transportation issues and can help frame a class discussion over what actions cities can take to improve transportation.


---

**READINGS ON SAFETY**


A number of large American cities have adopted plans to end traffic deaths. These plans demonstrate ambitious goals to change the streetscape in a dramatic way, placing user safety above speed. Seattle’s plan is one example, but look for other cities’ plans if you are interested, including New York, Portland, Chicago and Los Angeles.

A PDF version of the plan is available on the City of Seattle webpage: http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/beSuperSafe/VisionZeroPlan.pdf

---

**READINGS ON IMPLEMENTING CHANGE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD**


This practical guide focuses on how average citizens can become involved in decisions affecting streets in their communities. It serves as a much needed “how-to” supplement to the course curriculum. In addition to basic background on transportation processes and agencies, the guide also has practical, in-the-weeds type sections such as “Dealing with Government Bureaucracies” and “Understanding Transportation Engineers.”

A PDF version of the guide is available for free on the Project for Public Spaces website: http://www.pps.org/reference/a-citizens-guide-to-better-streets-how-to-engange-your-transportation-agency/

Transportation Alternatives – “Neighborhood Traffic Monitoring Toolkit” (2011)

This toolkit, while designed for New Yorkers, contains many practical tips and useful forms and examples for carrying out a traffic monitoring exercise in your neighborhood.
The toolkit includes suggestions and implementation help for conducting pedestrian intercept surveys and carrying out traffic counts.

A PDF version of the toolkit is available for free on the Transportation Alternatives website:

---

**Readings on Citizen Participation**


This canonical text in the field of public involvement details eight “rungs on a ladder of citizen participation,” ranging from various degrees of non-participation (manipulation, therapy) and tokenism (informing, consultation, placation) to citizen power (partnership, delegated power, citizen control). Arnstein notes that the typology “does not include an analysis of the most significant roadblocks to achieving genuine levels of participation. These roadblocks lie on both sides of the simplistic fence. On the power-holders’ side, they include racism, paternalism, and resistance to power redistribution. On the have-nots’ side, they include inadequacies of the poor community’s political socioeconomic infrastructure and knowledge-base, plus difficulties of organizing a representative and accountable citizens’ group in the face of futility, alienation, and distrust.”

A PDF version of the original article is available for free on the American Planning Association website:

---

**Readings on Complete Streets**

Marc Schlossberg, John Rowell, Dave Amos & Kelly Sanford – “Rethinking Streets: An Evidence-Based Guide to 25 Complete Streets Transformations” (2013)

This highly visual and attractive collection of case studies provides numerous examples of streets that have been redesigned to accommodate all users. Each case study includes numerous before-and-after pictures, cross-sections and maps, including innumerable ideas for changes that can improve a streetscape and community.

A PDF version of the book is available for free at http://www.rethinkingstreets.com/

---

**Readings on Building Walkable and Bikeable Communities**

This guide provides straightforward information about the things that residents can do to improve their community for walking and biking, who they can turn to for help, and where they can turn for more information and resources.

A PDF version of the guide is available for free on the FHWA website: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/ped_cmnity/ped_walkguide/residents_guide2014_final.pdf

Sam Schwartz Engineering and America Walks – “Steps to a Walkable Community: A Guide for Citizens, Planners, and Engineers”

This 180-page guide outlines dozens of tactics that citizens and professionals can use to transform their communities into walkable places. Tactics are organized into categories, including land use, and design and engineering tactics, among other types. Each tactic is presented in a quick two-page overview, which includes the benefits, considerations, appropriate contexts, guidance and a case study for each tactic.

A PDF version of the guide is available for free through America Walks at the following website: https://www.scribd.com/doc/261463434/Steps-to-a-Walkable-Community

---

**Readings on Transit**


While this manual is designed to help local advocates organize transit riders to push for improvements to transit service, it also offers a good look into how transit policy and decisions affect transit riders through a series of case studies. In addition, it provides a good list of transit-related resources.

A PDF version of the manual is available for free through the Good Jobs First website: http://www.goodjobsfirst.org/sites/default/files/docs/pdf/transitmanual.pdf