

Teddy Keizer For House District 42

1. General Approach. The City of Portland is often named the best bicycling city in the country. At the same time, car vehicle miles traveled are increasing while traffic congestion grows. Why do you think more Portlanders don't walk, bicycle, or take transit for transportation, and what will you do to help Portland (especially your legislative district) become an even better city to bike in, as well as a great city to walk and take transit?

Portlanders need to have transportation options, which means making alternative forms of transportation safer, more accessible, and more affordable. My priority is to support active transport and transit; maintaining existing infrastructure before expanding infrastructure for cars; prioritizing many smaller projects over single large projects of the same cost; crafting liveable, human scale neighborhoods that require shorter trips to work, play, and run errands; and, ensure safety for all residents.

In regards to accessibility, policymakers need to expand the current network of bike, pedestrian, and public transit services to be more inclusive. This means expanding services outside of the City of Portland in order to better accommodate many commuters and investing in alternative transportation options in other metro areas. I would advocate for expanding funding for ConnectOregon V, which has recently started distributing funds to alternative transit projects across the state. This also means creating a gridwork - both north/south and east/west - within Portland for bike and pedestrian friendly infrastructure.

It is key that we keep safety in mind for all pedestrians, cyclists, and public transit users. When surveyed, a majority of Portlanders say that they would like to ride their bikes but don't because they are scared of cars. We need to look for opportunities to create a comprehensive system that is clearly marked and separated enough from vehicular traffic. Right now, there are still many roads that are not bike or pedestrian friendly, due to a lack of sidewalks, well marked bike lanes, and crosswalks. I strongly support raising funding that goes towards these projects so that more people feel safe biking or walking.

We also need to make sure public transit is kept affordable. Increasing transit rates will prevent some people from accessing transit. At the same time, increasing fare rates will discourage car owners from using public transit if they do not view it as a cheaper alternative to driving. As a legislator, I will be committed to finding innovative ways to finance public transit projects by finding new ways to increase revenue.

2. Choices and Public Perception. Critics of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects often contend cyclists, pedestrians, and transit users don't pay their fair share in road taxes and other user fees. How would you make the case for allocating funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects?

I find critics of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects to be unconvincing because every cyclist and pedestrian is keeping a car off the road. Compared to vehicular traffic, active transport has an infinitesimal impact on the need for road maintenance. In turn, every car taken off the road is saving taxpayers money. In addition, bike and pedestrian infrastructure is vastly less expensive compared to infrastructure for cars. From a financial perspective, even people that drive cars should promote active transport because it saves them significantly in taxes.

As highlighted in the third question, approximately 25% of Oregonians are unable to drive. I strongly believe that these people should have accessible alternative forms of transportation. It is not fair that these people are perceived as not paying their fair share. These individuals pay taxes other than the gas tax, which does go towards the maintenance of roads, transit, bike, and pedestrian paths. I also view the gas tax like a vice tax because we should be encouraging Oregonians to use less fossil fuels if we are actively trying to reduce the effects of global climate change. Consequently, this incentivizes individuals to walk, cycle, or use transit instead of driving.

3. State Funding for Active Transportation. HB 1700 from 1971 (ORS 366.514) requires the state set aside at least 1% of the highway fund to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Meanwhile, one-quarter of Oregonians (roughly a million people) are too poor, young, old or infirm to drive. Do you feel that the 1% is an adequate allotment to fulfill the safety and transportation needs of the ever-increasing bicycling and pedestrian community? If not, what would you do to change it?

One of my main policy objectives will be to promote alternative forms of transportation that are sustainable and affordable. It simply does not make sense that 1% of highway funding is going toward services that will meet the needs of approximately 25% of Oregonians. I also strongly believe that investing in bike and pedestrian facilities that are safe and accessible will further encourage more people to bike or walk. This is not only sustainable but improves public health in Portland.

4. Traffic Safety. Traffic-related crashes are the top cause of death and injury for Oregonians aged 1 to 34. Pedestrian injuries and deaths are a serious problem in Oregon, with one serious injury a day and one death a week, encompassing 14% of traffic deaths in Oregon and 30% of deaths in Portland. Not surprisingly, most walkers and cyclists are injured or killed on busy streets. How will you improve traffic safety for walkers and bicyclists, especially for youth?

◦ Traffic speed is the leading factor in crashes (even above alcohol), and one of the largest contributors to whether a crash is fatal. Is safety the highest priority of the transportation system? If so (or if not) what policy and implications does that have, especially when it comes to slowing cars and protecting vulnerable roadway users? Will you commit to a Vision Zero strategy calling for zero tolerance for road fatalities and commit to developing standards and policies to reach those goals?

Safety should be the top priority in any infrastructure system. I strongly believe that traffic related deaths need to be seriously addressed and assessed during any transit, bike, or pedestrian planning process.

One idea that comes to mind is investing in more lighted crosswalks, which will benefit both pedestrians and cyclists. I am also in favor of legislation that would introduce “Safe Routes to School” curriculum. According to this policy, children growing up in Oregon would learn pedestrian, cycling, and transit safety from a young age.

We also need to make sure that our roadways are safe for cyclists, pedestrians, and public transit users. This is why I am in favor of reducing road speeds in highly congested areas that often share space with cyclists and pedestrians. We need to make an effort to make roadways an

inclusive place for multimodal forms of transportation.

As a legislator, I will also commit to a Vision Zero strategy that would require zero tolerance for road fatalities because it is imperative that we keep our cyclists and pedestrians safe.

5. Sensible Traffic Laws. For over 30 years, Idaho has had a law allowing cyclists to treat stop signs as yield signs, and come to a rolling stop instead of a complete stop (out of understanding of the laws of physics and the excessive use of stop signs on neighborhood streets). Over those last 30 years, Idaho police departments have seen no increase in safety problems, and have provided testimony in favor of the law. The Oregon legislature has considered passing a similar law in Oregon, but has failed to. What are your views on such a proposal?

I agree with cycling advocates that Oregon should have similar legislation to Idaho with the condition that there are no increases in safety problems. It is important that the legislature acknowledges the technical differences between cycling and driving, which makes it much more difficult for cyclists to come to a complete stop at a stop sign. From my own experience biking in Southeast Portland, almost every neighborhood intersection has at least a two way stop. Much of the time, there are no vehicles at these intersections and safety wise, a complete stop for a cyclist seems unnecessary. In order to fairly represent the continually expanding cycling community, Oregon's laws should reflect the differences between bikes and cars.

6. CRC Highway Mega-project. There has been a lot of pressure to build the most expensive public works project in the region's history, the five-mile long highway project known as the Columbia River Crossing. Despite being a multi-billion dollar project, bicycle and pedestrian facilities involved are substandard, including an under-highway mile-long path, a five-block corkscrew detour into Vancouver, and a mostly minimum-width-allowed 16-foot path width, all for a facility designed to serve the next 100 years. The project is diverting billions of dollars from other regional priorities to build an expansion that won't solve congestion. What are your views on the mega-project and what would you do about its funding as a legislator?

I am strongly opposed to the current Columbia River Crossing proposal. I agree with the statement from Bike, Walk, Vote, in that the current proposal will not solve the current congestion problems and does not sufficiently address the concerns of bicyclists and pedestrians. Recently, too much focus has been placed on building the proposed Columbia River Crossing mega-project. Those flexible federal funds used for the past \$100 million spent by Oregon on planning and promoting the CRC should have been spent for the 109 construction projects that ODOT has on the waiting list for flexible federal funds.

As a legislator, I would not support the funding of the proposal, as I strongly believe we need to use our resources to address other regional priorities, such as increasing pedestrian and bike paths.

7. Cleaner Transportation, Better Choices through Land Use. Smart land use planning has a huge effect on how many people use transportation choices. In 2010, legislators passed Senate Bill 1059, which requires Metro to make its land use planning decisions lead to specific reductions in global warming pollution. It also requires Eugene-Springfield to plan on how it would accomplish such reductions. Would you support an effort to provide \$300,000 for a grant to do scenario planning for one of Oregon's other four Metro areas, which would be designed as a competitive pilot effort to model how Salem/Keizer, Corvallis, the Rogue Valley, or Bend could reduce their transportation pollution? If so, how would you go about finding that funding?

As an environmental advocate and co-founder of Oregonians for Renewable Energy Progress (OREP), it has been one of my goals to promote alternative forms of energy to reduce the impact of global climate change. I agree the same concept should be applied to city planning. As a legislator, I would support a proposal to provide \$300,000 to one of the four listed metro areas to reduce transportation pollution.

In regards to funding, I would support proposals to increase revenues. Some specific examples that come to mind are increasing the allocation of funds to alternative transit through ConnectOregon V, increasing lottery bonds, and increasing various vices taxes, such as cigarette tax or a carbon tax. I also support expanding funding for STIP, which in turn could allocate funds to expand public transit. I will also work together with local and federal government to find new means for funding.

8. Transit funding. Transit systems throughout the state continue to struggle to make ends meet, especially in their quest for operating funds. In response, often service is cut while fares are increased. While the payroll tax cap was increased in 2009, it only increased for some cities. If you think public transit funding is inadequate, what sources of funds would you work increase or create as a legislator?

In order to make alternative forms of transportation more popular, I believe we need to make it affordable and accessible. As a legislator, I would support efforts by cities to increase their local taxes in order to expand public transit. As mentioned in other parts of the questionnaire, I believe there are a few ways we can increase funding for public transit:

- 1) Increasing percentage of funding from ConnectOregon V that goes towards transit. According to ODOT, after the passage of SB 260, transit only received 11% of ConnectOregon V funding.
- 2) Creating a carbon tax: One way to increase funding and deal with the decreasing effectiveness of the gas tax, is to establishing a carbon tax. This tax could be used to maintain existing infrastructure and alternative transportation options, including public transit. It also would directly impact behavior by putting a price on carbon and lead people to choose alternative options.
- 3) Use federal funding to improve and expand current transit, instead of focusing a large portion of funds on projects that do not seek to expand ridership.

9. Transportation Equity. Recent census data show nearly 10,000 people of color, mostly African Americans, have moved from Portland's city core to the city's eastern edges over the past ten years. East Portland has much sparser sidewalks and bikeways, grocery stores and parks, and less access to transit. How would you ensure these increasingly diverse and historically under-invested neighborhoods are revitalized for their current residents? How would you improve transportation choices for low income communities and communities of color?

I strongly believe that all Oregonians should have access to transit. This includes those communities in East Portland that are historically underserved. We need to prioritize public transit funding for low-income communities, in which there is a greater percentage of people that depend on public transit, walking, and biking. I strongly support allocating transportation funding to reflect the percentage of Oregonians that use these services.

10. Health. How will you make sure that transportation priorities support Oregon's greenhouse gas emission reduction goals?

I am a strong proponent of taking dramatic steps to address the growing problem of global climate change. In fact, in 2008, I helped start a nonprofit called Oregonians for Renewable Energy Progress (OREP), with the specific goal of advocating for the increase in renewable energy alternatives to move us from a carbon based economy to a green energy economy. We have worked tirelessly to promote the successful Feed In Tariff pilot, a statewide solar code, and making it easier for cooperatives to fund renewable projects.

It is from this background that I strongly support promoting zero emission transportation options. Transportation is a top contributor to Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions. From talking to people across House District 42, I have learned that many are becoming increasingly concerned with greenhouse gas emissions as the result of increasing traffic. I agree that we can reduce car traffic by making public transit, biking, and walking more accessible. This ties into my priority of increasing funding for public transit, bike, and pedestrian paths.

From a policy perspective, opposing transportation projects that will only increase traffic and subsequently impact air quality is essential. Air quality in SE Portland is surprisingly bad. As a legislator, I will stand up against projects that will only further contribute to greenhouse gas emissions.

11. Personal Example and Understanding. How do you currently travel around town, and how do you commute to work?

Southeast Portland is a great place to live without driving often. I live just off of Hawthorne Boulevard on 30th Avenue, which is close to retail shops, restaurants, and entertainment that is easy to reach by foot. I have a home office so that I do not have to commute. I have a grocery store one block away, my bank is five blocks away, and a hardware store six blocks away, all within easy walking distance.

I am also an avid outdoorsman and a social cyclist. My family and I participate in the bridge pedal every year. I spend a lot of my spare time doing outdoor activities that do not require a car, such as hiking or going to the park, which is also just one block away.

12. Past active transportation accomplishments. What are your specific

accomplishments in helping improve conditions for bicycling, walking and accessing transit in Portland region, or other places?

In 2009 as a legislative staffer, I worked on a bill that attempted to eliminate the requirement to use gas tax in a road's right of way. With this change, gas tax dollars could be used on infrastructure like the Springwater Corridor. Unfortunately, gas tax dollars are stipulated in the Oregon Constitution and would require a referral to the voters.

I have been a crew leader for Friends of Trees and have helped out with their bicycle tree plantings over the years. I have also served on the OLCV Steering Committee, working to elect legislators who are committed to expanded alternative forms of transportation and other environmental issues. I am also a member of the Bicycle Transportation Alliance.

13. Vision. Five years from now, what will you say when asked, "Over the past five years, what has the State accomplished with regard to transportation and what was your influence on that?"

One of my main motivations for running for office is to champion environmental issues. As Oregonians, if we are going to take the threat of global climate change seriously, we need to make lifestyle changes. This includes using less fossil fuels and investing more in renewables to transition from a fossil fuel to a renewable based economy. Consequently, we must promote walking, cycling, and public transit.

In five years, I hope that the Oregon Legislature will have made a clear increase in focus in policy and funding for active transportation and public transit. I hope that the a carbon tax will have been passed that could provide funding to these these projects, as well as, renewable energy projects. Additionally, I hope that in five years we have a more realistic plan for an I-5 replacement project that will address active transportation and public transit at a much more reasonable environmental and financial cost.

As a legislator, I will work to ensure that Oregon is on the path to a more comprehensive system for alternative forms of transportation so that it appeals to more Oregonians. Children need to have safer routes to schools and adults should have safer alternatives to get to work, play, and do errands. This is why I want to represent House District 42 in the Legislature.

14. Campaign Viability. What makes you a viable candidate for state Representative? How do you differentiate yourself from your opponent?

To my knowledge, I have been the only candidate in this race that has been outspoken in my opposition to the Columbia River Crossing mega-project. I am also the only candidate that has previously run for office. In 2008, when I ran for the state legislature, I knocked on thousands of doors and people remember and recognize that effort as I canvass during this campaign. Additionally, I have received over \$137,000 in total contributions so far from over 425 individual donors. I have 32 current or former elected officials that have endorsed my candidacy, as well as the Sierra Club and the Oregon League of Conservation Voters. These endorsements give me the credibility as the clear choice for those that care deeply about the health of our environment. With a growing volunteer base, as a team, we are on a path to victory.

15. Transportation Network. The reach of expensive, high-capacity transit investments is typically limited to corridors and town centers. At the same time, the bus system that feeds into the high capacity system is experiencing significant service cuts. What is your strategy for developing true geographic and demographic equity in the region's transportation network?

It is important that we develop alternative transportation infrastructure that is accessible to all Oregonians, regardless of their income and the geographic region. As a native of Coos Bay, Oregon, I think it is important to expand services in rural areas.

Again, this issue comes back to financing. I strongly support allocating more funds from both STIP and ConnectOregon towards public high-capacity transit. I strongly believe that we should grow programs to develop comprehensive transportation systems in smaller metropolitan areas and in the Portland suburbs if we are going to truly expand ridership.

To meet the goals outlined in this questionnaire, it is going to take the dedication of many people and groups. Being a legislator representing House District 42 would put me in a great position to be a key person in this effort. Working together, we can achieve a lot for bike, pedestrian, and transit options in Oregon.