

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
PLAN

) ORDINANCE NO. 82-135
)
) Introduced by the Joint
) Policy Advisory Committee
) on Transportation

THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT HEREBY ORDAINS:

1. The Metropolitan Service District Regional Transportation Plan, dated March, 1982, with the amendments set forth in a memorandum to Council from the Executive Officer dated June 10, 1982, copies of which are on file with the Clerk of the Council, is hereby adopted effective July 1, 1982.

2. In support of the above Plan, the Findings attached hereto as Attachment "A" are hereby approved.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 1st day of July, 1982.

Cindy Bantz
Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Sue Hayes
Clerk of the Council

JG/gl
6014B/107
7/02/82

ATTACHMENT A

FINDINGS

1. In 1979, Metro was designated by the Governor as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Oregon urban portion of the Portland metropolitan area to receive and disburse federal funds for transportation projects pursuant to Title 23 (Highways) and Title 49 (Transportation) Code of Federal Regulations and Oregon Revised Statutes - Chapter 268.
2. Metro staff has completed a comprehensive effort to develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for adoption by the Metro Council.
3. Adoption of a functional plan for transportation by Metro is required by State law to establish the relation to local comprehensive plans and necessary by federal regulations to maintain the eligibility of the region to receive federal transportation funds.
4. The RTP as adopted by the accompanying Ordinance is consistent with the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals as is indicated by the following paragraphs:

Goal #1 - Citizen Participation. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) provided a forum for elected officials and representatives of agencies involved in transportation projects to evaluate the transportation needs in this region and to oversee the development of the RTP. JPACT's membership includes nine elected officials from local governments within the region, two Metro Councilors, representatives of the agencies involved in regional transportation issues (Port of Portland, Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality), and representatives from governments and agencies of Clark County, Washington and the State of Washington.

While JPACT provided a forum for input to the RTP on a policy level, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) provided the opportunity for input on a technical level for staff from the same agencies and governments represented in JPACT plus representatives of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), the Regional Planning Council of Clark County and five citizen representatives appointed to TPAC by the Metro Presiding Officer.

In addition to these standing Metro committees, considerable input was also received directly from local jurisdictions and two local transportation committees--the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee and the Washington County Transportation Committee.

In addition, since July 1980, a significant effort has been made to involve the region's citizenry in the development of the Plan. The following list details the meetings held to receive citizen input for the document:

Clackamas County Community	
Planning Organization Leaders	50
Air Quality Advisory Committee	25
Neighbors North	16
Southeast Uplift	25
Hosford-Abernathy Neighborhood	17
Oregon Association of Rail Passengers	23
Southeast Gray Panthers	18
Humboldt Neighborhood Association	21
Tigard Loaves and Fishes	25
Women in Public Management	18
Peninsula Optimist Club	22
Parkrose Community Planning Group	20
Commission on Aging	16
Washington County Public Officials' Caucus	27
Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association	15
Cleveland High School (3 classes)	90
Gresham Transit Corridor Task Force	23
Washington County CPO #3	19
Inter-Southeast Neighborhood Coalition	10
Omark Industries	9
Sullivan Gulch Neighborhood Association	16
Buckman Neighborhood Association	17
Public Hearing Draft Two - Metro	37
Wilkes Community Citizens	26
Portland Energy Commission	3
Rideshare Advisory Subcommittee	17
Tigard Chamber of Commerce	45
North Clackamas Chamber	9
League of Women Voters	40
League of Women Voters	22
Parkrose Community Planning Organization	15
Wellington Park Lions Club	22

Oregon Federation of Highway Users	11
Forest Grove Chamber of Commerce	31
Lower Tualatin Valley Home Owners Preservation League, Inc.	10
Beaverton Chamber of Commerce- Transportation Committee	10
Portland City Club-Transportation Committee	7
Association for Portland Progress	11
82nd Avenue Business Association	35
Downtown Portland Lions	24
Portland Wheel and Touring Club	35
Northeast Business Association	30
City Club-Transportation Committee evening panel	50
Regional Media Briefing-Recommended Plan	20
Public Meeting-Recommended Plan	25

Notice of the public meeting was mailed to 550 elected officials, citizen groups, and interested persons. Related news articles on the RTP have appeared in the following publications: The Oregonian, the Oregon Journal, the Valley Times, the Lake Oswego Review, the Hillsboro Argus and the Gresham Outlook.

Goal #2 - Land Use Planning. The RTP is based on a population and employment growth forecast to the year 2000 using the adopted local comprehensive land use plans of the region's jurisdictions. The forecasts were developed in a cooperative manner through a series of workshops attended by representatives from the cities and counties in the region as well as other interested agencies.

Goals #3 and #4 - Agricultural Lands and Forest Lands. This action is not inconsistent with Goals #3 and #4. Efficient provision of transportation services within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is essential to reduce premature pressures to develop rural agricultural and forest land.

Goal #5 - Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources. This action is not inconsistent with Goal #5. Projects recommended in the plan that significantly impact these resources are required by federal law to prepare detailed environmental impact documentation to determine potential adverse effects and outline actions to mitigate the unavoidable effects.

Goal #6 - Air, Land and Water Resources Quality. The air quality impacts of transportation will be lessened by the

implementation of the RTP. In addition, the RTP is in conformance with plans adopted to meet federal carbon monoxide and ozone standards. The adoption of the RTP is not inconsistent with the land and water resources aspects of Goal #6.

Goal #7 - Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards. The RTP is based on the inventory of known areas of natural disaster and hazard contained in the local comprehensive plans and is not inconsistent with Goal #7.

Goal #8 - Recreational Needs. This plan is consistent with Goal #8 in that the accessibility to developed recreational areas in the region will be improved.

Goal #9 - Economy of the State. Adoption of an RTP is necessary for certification of the region and continued receipt of federal transportation construction funding. The receipt of these funds is essential to the ability of the region to service expected urban development. In addition, numerous development opportunities in the region are significantly dependent on the improved access provided by projects in the RTP.

Goal #10 - Housing. One of the key limiting factors in the residential development called for in the local comprehensive plans is an adequate urban infrastructure of streets to serve that development. The implementation of the RTP would provide that urban infrastructure.

Goal #11 - Public Facilities and Services. This plan establishes a framework whereby local jurisdictions, the ODOT and Tri-Met can provide necessary transportation services in a coordinated and cost-effective manner. This action satisfies the Goal #11 dictate "to plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban...development."

Goal #12 - Transportation. The adoption of the RTP represents the establishment of the region's functional transportation plan required by Goal #12.

Goal #13 - Energy Conservation. The implementation of the RTP will reduce the transportation-related energy consumed in the region from what will occur without implementation of the Plan.

Goal #14 - Urbanization. Efficient provision of transportation services is essential if the planned urbanization of land within the UGB is to occur. The adoption of the RTP will provide the framework for the provision of those transportation services.



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT
527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

MEMORANDUM

Date: June 10, 1982
To: Metro Council
From: Executive Officer
Regarding: Proposed Changes to the Recommended Regional
Transportation Plan

Several RTP presentations have been made to local jurisdictional policy-making bodies in order to secure endorsements for the Plan. In addition to the letters attached to this memo, endorsements have been secured from the Portland City Council and the Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee. Subsequent to Metro Council adoption, the Oregon Transportation Commission will adopt the RTP as the metropolitan element of the Statewide Transportation Plan.

During the endorsement process, the following proposed changes to the document have emerged:

New Appendix (A)

1. The addition of Appendix A (attached) consisting of a detailed description of the local comprehensive plan compliance aspects of the RTP is proposed. This was deemed necessary to provide local policy-makers a concise statement of the implementation aspects of the Plan as it affected their local plans, without the need to cross reference portions of the full document. (Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group)

Summary: Economic Development

1. Include Figure 6-10, page 6-19, showing affected economic developments in the Summary of the RTP to emphasize this aspect of the Plan. Reference the figure at the end of the Economic Development paragraph on page 7. (Staff)

Principal Routes and Major Arterials Map

(Figure 1, page 2) (Figure 4-1, page 4-6) and (Figure 4-1, page 2 of proposed Appendix A)

1. Downgrade Highway 213 south of Oregon City from a principal to a major arterial in order to remain consistent with the highway functional class criteria detailed in the RTP. (Staff)
2. Add overcrossing from Yeon to Front Avenue as a major arterial. (Port of Portland)

3. Potential major arterial routes: In order to indicate the unresolved nature of the potential major arterial routes designated on the map, footnote legend to read: "need and alignment to be determined". (Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group)

Highway Functional Classification Criteria: Major Arterials

1. Add the following sentence to the first paragraph on page 1-8, Section 2, to indicate access function of major arterials to major port facilities: Access to major port facilities should be provided by major arterials. (Staff)

Minimum Levels of Highway Service: Minor Arterials and Collectors

1. Using the arterial level-of-service criteria as a minimum required on the local system would prove to be unworkable. Using these criteria as target project objectives, however, is desirable. Rewrite text following table reference in last paragraph of page 8-3 to read: Project objectives for these investments should include at least the arterial level-of-service defined as minimum desired in the RTP (page 1-6). (Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group)

The RTP technical appendix on travel forecasting will include documentation on how to calculate and apply these criteria.

Highway Functional Classification Criteria: Federal Aid System

1. To more clearly specify the intended composition of the Federal Aid Urban system designated in the RTP, rewrite the current definition on page 1-7 to read: Metro's adopted functional classification system within the urban area will consist of the Principal and Major Arterial routes designated in this Plan (Figure 4-1, page 4-6) plus a) the Minor Arterial and Collectors and b) streets designated for transit service derived from the adopted local comprehensive plans. This will constitute the Federal Aid Urban system and, as such, will provide the basis for federal funding eligibility. (Staff)

In addition, reword the first sentence on page 8-3 to be consistent with the preceding language.

Regional Transit Trunk Routes

(Figure 2, page 3) (Figure 4-2, page 4-12) and (Figure 4-2, page 6 of proposed Appendix A)

1. Delete transit center notations from Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway/Scholls and Sunset Highway/Sylvan due to the small

size of these transit transfer opportunities. (Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group).

2. Revise legend to specify the following types of transit improvements: LRT, Buslane(s), and Transitway. Designate the Banfield and Westside insets as LRT, add an inset showing a Sunset Busway alternative, denote Barbur Boulevard and the Clackamas Town Center to I-205 improvement as Buslane(s), and designate the McLoughlin improvement as a Transitway. (TPAC)

Long-Range Regional Transitway System

(Figure 3, page 4) (Figure 4-4, page 4-14) and (Figure 4-4, page 7 of the proposed Appendix A)

1. Add the Burlington Northern and Tualatin Valley Highway alignments west of Beaverton to Hillsboro as transitway alternatives to ensure sufficient options for the Beaverton-Hillsboro connection. (Washington County, Westside Corridor Project Planning Management Group, Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group)
2. I-205 should be designated a Transitway between Foster Road and the Washington side of the Columbia River and between I-205 and the PIA passenger terminal in order to be consistent with the Multnomah County Plan. The right-of-way has already been reserved, construction is underway, and the extremely cost-effective nature should be recognized by this designation. (Multnomah County)

Regional Transitway Policies

1. In order to more clearly indicate that not all regional trunk route corridors are necessarily suitable for transitway conversion, rewrite sentence following first bullet on page 1-12, Section 6, to read: Regional transitways will be considered for individual regional trunk route corridors as appropriate to economically provide required high speed and/or high capacity transit service. (Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee Technical Group)

Transitway Implementation

1. The staff resource difficulty associated with pursuing multiple transitway corridors simultaneously is specifically related to the preparation of the environmental documentation. Rewrite the last sentence of Section 5, page 8-5,

to read: Due to limited staff resources, it is impractical to pursue the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements on several transitway corridors simultaneously. (Public Meeting - John Frewing, Tri-Met)

Demand Management Program Criteria: Land Use

1. In order to more clearly indicate the need for the consideration of higher densities that support transit service along routes other than just regional trunk routes, rewrite the last sentence following the second bullet on page 1-15 to read: Employment, commercial and residential densities should be maximized around planned transit stations and regional transit trunk route stops compatible with other local objectives. Compatible increases in density should be considered along sub-regional and local transit routes. (Staff)

Outstanding Issues

1. The addition, as #22 on page 8-12, of the following: I-205/ Powell Boulevard east of I-205 Circulation - Issues surrounding the functional classification and I-205 freeway access in the area of Division and Powell need to be resolved. The specification of this issue responds to concerns expressed about the difficulty and confusion for the East County user in accessing the I-205 freeway in this area. (Gresham Planning Commission and the Gresham City Council)
2. Goods Movement (#7): In order to more clearly emphasize the importance of goods movement on the transportation system, add the following phrase prior to the first sentence after the Goods Movement heading on page 8-10: "Recognizing that freight movement is equally as important as people movement in an effective transportation system,....." (Central East-side Industrial Council)

The meeting report from the April 28, 1982 public meeting on the RTP is attached.

AC:JG:lmk

Enclosures



Department of Transportation
HIGHWAY DIVISION

TRANSPORTATION BUILDING, SALEM, OREGON 97310

June 3, 1982

RECEIVED
JUN 8 1982
METRO SERVICE DISTRICT

In Reply Refer to
File No.

LOC

Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer
Metropolitan Service District
527 S.W. Hall Street
Portland, OR 97201

I would like to express to you my sincere appreciation for the excellent presentation by Mr. Andy Cotugno of your office to the Oregon Transportation Commission at its May meeting concerning the proposed Portland Region Transportation Plan.

Following the presentation, the Commission instructed that a letter be forwarded indicating its general support of the Plan, and intent to include it as part of the Statewide Transportation Plan, following its adoption by the agencies affected.

It should be understood that support of the Plan is contingent upon availability of funds, and the continued updating of it to resolve outstanding issues.

The Metropolitan Service District and local jurisdictions involved in the development of this coordinated effort are to be congratulated for an outstanding accomplishment.

Again, my thanks for Andy's presentation of the Plan and his informational report on the Westside Transit Study.

H. S. Coulter, P.E.
State Highway Engineer

HSC:ia

cc Transportation Commission

In the Matter of Endorsing
the Adoption of a Regional
Transportation Plan for the
Portland Metropolitan Area

This matter coming before the Board as a result of Clackamas County's participation in the development of a Regional Transportation Plan, and

It further appearing that the Metropolitan region has been working through its Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Committee for many years to develop a Regional Transportation Plan, and

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that Clackamas County endorses the adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Robert Schumacher, Commissioner

Stan Skoko, Commissioner

QTY	DISTRIBUTION	DATE	INT.
	Director		
/	Assoc. Director		
	Asst. Director		
	Manager		
	U. S. S.		
	Departmental Exp.		
	Finance		
	Payroll		
	Personal Exp.		
	Travel Exp.		
	Postage Exp.		
	Office Exp.		



East Multnomah County Transportation Committee


RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Metropolitan Service District has submitted to the Committee a draft Recommended Regional Transportation Plan, and

Whereas, the draft plan was presented to the Committee on January 13, 1982, by MSD staff, and

Whereas, Committee members have reviewed the draft Plan,

BE IT RESOLVED the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee endorses the Recommended Regional Transportation Plan dated January, 1982.



Gordon Shadburne, Chairman

2/22/82

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

In the Matter of Endorsing the Recommended)
Regional Transportation Plan) R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Service District has submitted to the County the Recommended Regional Transportation Plan dated March, 1982, and

WHEREAS, the plan dated March, 1982, has been reviewed by the County and that review finds that I-205 should be designated as a Transitway on Figure 3 and Figure 4-4 between Foster Road and the Washington side of the Columbia River and between I-205 and the Portland International Airport passenger terminal, and

WHEREAS, the previous plan draft dated January, 1982, was reviewed and endorsed by the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee on February 22, 1982, NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners endorses the Recommended Regional Transportation Plan dated March, 1982, with the I-205 Transitway designation change listed above and with the reservation that all project lists included in the document are subject to change. Any subsequent changes in the plan necessitate County review before endorsement of those changes.

DATED this 22nd day of April, 1982.

SEAL

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By *Carolyn Miller*
Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

JOHN B. LEAHY
County Counsel
for Multnomah County, Oregon

By *John B. Leahy*

RESOLUTION NO. 1032

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ADOPTION BY THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT OF THE RECOMMENDED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN WITH AN ADDITION TO THE PROJECTS REQUIRING FURTHER REVIEW

The City of Gresham Finds:

a. The Metropolitan Service District presented its Recommended Regional Transportation Plan, dated March 1982, to the City of Gresham for review.

b. The Gresham Planning Commission reviewed the plan at its regularly scheduled meeting of April 13, 1982.

c. The Plan fails to address the I-205/Powell Blvd./Division Street circulation and access program.

d. The Planning Commission endorsed the Plan with the following addition to the projects (listed on pages 8-11 and 8-12 of the Plan) which require further review and consensus-building prior to inclusion in the Plan:

The I-205/Powell Blvd./Division Street Circulation and Access Program


THE GRESHAM CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES:

The City Council supports the adoption by the Metropolitan Service District of the Recommended Regional Transportation Plan dated March 1982, with the following addition to the projects (listed on pages 8-11 and 8-12 of the Plan) which require further review and consensus-building prior to inclusion in the Plan:

The I-205/Powell Blvd./Division Street Circulation and Access Program.

Passed by the Gresham City Council on May 4, 1982.

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
BECKER	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
BROWN	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
FOUNELLE	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
HUTCHES	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
MILERS	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
PETERSON	<u>X</u>	—	—	—
WEIL	<u>X</u>	—	—	—


City Manager


Mayor



Clark County

**BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS**

P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Wa. 98668
(206) 699-2232

Vernon Veysey
District 1

David Sturdevant
District 2

John McKibbin
District 3

RECEIVED MAR 4 1982

March 2, 1982

Mr. Andrew Cotugno
Transportation Director
Metropolitan Service District
527 SW Hall Street
Portland, OR 97201

Dear Mr. Cotugno:

I have reviewed with interest Metro's Regional Transportation Plan, particularly with regard to travel to and from Clark County on I-5 and I-205. The Plan is comprehensive and well documented. I have only two specific comments. First, the population and employment figures for the year 2000 forecast are consistent with our figures. Second, the statement in paragraph two on page 6 of the plan summary is a subjective interpretation of Clark County land use controls. The statement about Clark County development should be ended after the word "development," striking out the words "fewer land use controls."

As evidenced in the RTP, the safe and efficient travel on I-5 and I-205 is important to the economic prosperity of the region. During the past several months, two regional projects of particular importance to Clark County were moved ahead in construction scheduling, and will result in region-wide economic benefits. The FY84 and FY87 scheduled reconstruction of the Slough Bridge and the 1982 early opening of the I-205 Bridge are projects which will significantly improve interstate travel for people and goods.

I want to thank Metro for their support of these two projects.

Sincerely,

Vern Veysey
Commissioner

VV/bu



STATE OF OREGON

INTEROFFICE MEMO
7 RECEIVED DEC 10 1981

CC: K.L.
J.G.
K.B.

TO: Andrew Cotugno

DATE: December 15, 1981

FROM: William H. Young *why*

SUBJECT: Comments on Preliminary Draft of the METRO Recommended Regional
Transportation Plan (RTP)

The Department commends METRO for developing a progressive long-range transportation plan which not only serves the expected growth in regional population and employment, but also contains maximum benefits for air quality. We recognize the funding difficulties associated with the RTP and will support your efforts to find the necessary financial resources to implement the plan.

For improvement to the draft document, the Department recommends that some language should be inserted in Chapter 8, briefly addressing the Carbon Monoxide State Implementation Plan. Specifically, after item 12 on page 8-9, we suggest that the following new paragraph be inserted.

Carbon Monoxide (CO) State Implementation Plan - Early in 1982 Metro will adopt a plan to meet federal CO standards by 1985. This plan is primarily dependent upon the Downtown Portland Parking and Circulation Plan which is incorporated as part of the RTP. Long-range implications of the RTP on CO air quality will be examined to ensure the region stays in attainment with the federal CO standards.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important document. I hope our comments prove useful.

ahe

APPENDIX A

LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)


The comprehensive plan, adopted by the cities and counties within the Metro area, is the mechanism used by local jurisdictions to implement a number of elements of the RTP. It is the local plans which identify future development patterns that must be served by the transportation system. In addition, the local plans define the configuration of the highway system and identify needed investments.

A. REQUIRED ACTIVITIES

Local comprehensive plans and future amendments to local plans should be consistent with all RTP policies and guidelines for highway and transit system improvements and demand management programs described in this appendix. Specific items in the RTP that require local comprehensive plan compliance are as follows:

1. Highway System Design - It is essential for Metro and the local jurisdictions to designate the full arterial and collector system necessary to serve development of local comprehensive plans anticipated to the year 2000. The RTP includes criteria for a highway classification system (Attachment A) and adopts a map (Figure 1) delineating the principal and major arterial components of such a system. In accordance with this, local jurisdictions are required to adopt a map delineating these highways in their jurisdiction and in so doing, are recommended to adopt Metro's classification categories and definitions. If, however, the jurisdiction elects to retain their own classification categories, they must provide for Metro's adopted principal routes and major arterials as shown in Figure 1. In addition, local jurisdictions are required to designate an adequate Minor Arterial and Collector system to meet two objectives of regional interest:
 - the minor arterial/collector system must adequately serve the local travel demands expected from development of the land use plan to the year 2000 to ensure that the Principal and Major Arterial system is not overburdened with local traffic; and
 - the system should provide continuity between adjacent and affected jurisdictions (i.e., consistency between neighboring jurisdictions, consistency between city and county plans for county facilities within city boundaries and consistency between local jurisdiction and ODOT plans).

Metro's Classified Highway System map will consist of the Principal and Major Arterials defined in the RTP and the Minor Arterials and Collectors derived from the adopted local comprehensive plans.



2. Highway Projects - The RTP includes a large number of individual highway projects, primarily targeted at enabling the Principal and Major arterial system to provide the desired level of service and effectively serve travel demands expected by the year 2000. Those projects will be implemented by local jurisdictions and ODOT based upon the availability of funds.

Local jurisdictions must identify in their comprehensive plan (or the appropriate implementation program) sufficient investments in transportation capacity to ensure its arterial system can adequately serve at least the travel demand associated with Metro's year 2000 population and employment forecast (Table 2). Metro will review its forecasts annually and consider amendments to these forecasts to account for significant changes in growth rates, development patterns, and/or local comprehensive land use plans.

- Minor arterials should generally not be continuous across two or more subareas.
 - Linkage with collectors and major arterials.
 - The full freeway and arterial system (principal, major and minor) should comprise 15 - 25 percent of the total mileage and carry 65 - 80 percent of the total vehicle miles traveled.
4. Collectors - The collector system is deployed nearly entirely within subregions to provide mobility between communities and neighborhoods or from neighborhoods to the minor and major arterial systems. An adequate collector system is needed to ensure these movements do not occur on principal routes or major arterials. Land is directly accessible with emphasis on collection and distribution of trips within an arterial grid.

System Design Criteria

- System access to minor and major arterials and other collectors, as well as local streets.
 - Intersections with collectors and above consist of stop sign control and some signalization.
 - Parking is generally unrestricted.
 - Access should generally not be provided to freeways and principal arterials.
 - The collector system should comprise 5-10 percent of the total mileage and carry 5-10 percent of the total vehicle miles traveled.
5. Local Streets - The local street system is used throughout developed areas to provide for local circulation and direct land access. It provides mobility within neighborhoods and other homogeneous land uses, and comprises the largest percentage of total street mileage. In general, local traffic should not occur on Major Arterials and Principal Routes.

System Design Criteria

- Linkage to collectors and other local streets.
- Usually unrestricted parking.
- Trips are short and at low speeds.
- Service is almost exclusively direct property access.
- Access should not be provided to freeways and generally not to major arterials.
- Local streets should comprise 65-80 percent of the total mileage and carry 10-30 percent of the total vehicle miles traveled.

Table 2

1980-2000 20-DISTRICT
POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

		Population			Employment		
		1980	2000	Change	1980	2000	Change
District	1	10,690	14,890	+4,200	82,140	128,450	+46,310
District	2	314,500	329,710	+15,210	175,560	210,400	+34,840
District	3	79,400	102,170	+22,770	70,160	80,430	+10,270
District	4	76,950	93,670	+16,720	24,750	38,350	+13,600
District	5	77,970	134,270	+56,300	19,500	39,180	+19,680
District	20	5,840	6,330	+490	800	930	+130
Total							
Mult. Co.		565,350	681,040	+115,690	372,910	497,740	+124,830
District	6	64,300	67,930	+3,630	26,990	36,890	+9,900
District	7	17,650	41,050	+23,400	13,410	36,980	+23,570
District	8	43,390	70,060	+26,670	10,290	22,330	+12,040
District	9	24,560	40,730	+16,170	10,120	15,730	+5,610
District	10	19,450	40,290	+20,840	74,00	21,280	+13,880
District	19	72,590	104,810	+32,220	11,100	18,340	+7,240
Total							
Clack. Co.		241,940	364,870	+122,930	79,310	151,550	+72,240
District	11	13,270	29,950	+16,680	7,450	15,980	+8,530
District	12	29,470	46,020	+16,550	21,350	32,860	+11,510
District	13	72,910	84,330	+11,420	48,330	72,710	+24,380
District	14	57,720	104,740	+47,020	10,040	33,760	+23,720
District	15	30,970	59,320	+28,550	11,790	27,570	+15,780
District	16	19,440	30,750	+11,310	5,530	10,100	+4,570
District	18	21,650	28,500	+6,850	2,970	4,890	+1,920
Total							
Wash. Co.		245,420	383,610	+138,180	107,460	197,870	+90,410
Total							
Clark Co.		192,300	310,410	+118,110	59,140	122,830	+63,690
SMSA Total		1,245,020	1,739,930	+494,910	618,820	969,990	+351,170

In addition, project objectives for these investments in transportation capacity should include the following:

- Peak-hour average signal delay on the arterial system should be no longer than 35 seconds during the peak 90 minutes (equivalent to level of service "D") and no longer than an average of 40 seconds (level of service "E") during the peak 20 minutes of the morning and evening 90-minute peak.
- Average signal delay on the arterial system during the off-peak periods should be no longer than 25 seconds during the highest volume typical mid-day hour (equivalent to level of service "C").

Further improvements in transportation capacity consistent with the policies of the RTP that serve more than Metro's year 2000 population and employment forecast and/or to provide a higher level of traffic service can be provided at the option of the local jurisdiction. This identification of transportation capacity must be consistent with the level of transit ridership and ridesharing delineated in the RTP for the particular area, but may include actions to further expand the use of these modes, thereby reducing the need for additional highway capacity. These improvements should be designed to serve the designated function for the street and should first consider low cost actions (such as additional transit expansion, ridesharing, flextime, signal modifications, channelization, etc.) before consideration of a major widening investment.

3. Transit System Designation - The delineation of the transit system must be coordinated between Metro, Tri-Met and the local jurisdictions. Metro's adopted regional transit trunk route system provides direction to Tri-Met on where to target high speed, high capacity service for long distance travel and provides direction to local jurisdictions on where to target high density land uses. Local jurisdictions are required to include Metro's regional trunk routes, transit centers and park and ride lots (Figure 4-2) in their comprehensive plan and identify other streets suitable for subregional trunk routes and local transit service as a guide to Tri-Met.
4. Transitway Implementation - Transitways have been identified as the long-range method to provide regional trunk route service in the radial travel corridors (Figure 4-4). Local jurisdictions are required to identify these alignments in their local comprehensive plans for future consideration.

ATTACHMENT A

Highway Functional Classification Criteria


Metro's adopted functional classification system establishes the Major Arterials and Principal Routes and serves as the framework for endorsement of the local jurisdictions.


Metro's adopted functional classification system within the urban area will consist of these routes plus the Minor Arterials and Collectors derived from the adopted local comprehensive plans. This will constitute the Federal-Aid Urban system and, as such, will provide the basis for federal funding eligibility.

1. Principal Routes - This system provides the backbone for the roadway network. It serves through trips entering and leaving the urban area, as well as the majority of movements bypassing the central city. This system includes interstates, freeways, expressways and other principal arterials.

System Design Criteria

- An integrated system which is continuous throughout the urbanized area and also provides for statewide continuity of the rural arterial system.
- A principal arterial or freeway route should provide direct service 1) from each entry point to each exit point or 2) from each entry point to the I-405 loop (i.e., downtown). If more than one road is available, the most direct will be designated as the principal unless through traffic is incompatible with surrounding properties. Off-peak travel times should not be significantly increased through use of indirect routes.
- Freeways should be grade separated and other principal routes should provide a minimum of direct property access (driveways) to avoid conflicts between higher speed through travel and local access movements. Existing and proposed driveways should be consolidated on access frontage roads or side streets to the greatest extent possible.
- The principal route system inside the I-205/Hwy. 217 loop should be upgraded to freeway standards where feasible, with the exception of the McLoughlin Boulevard and I-505 Alternative routes, where adjacent land uses are not compatible with this treatment.
- In general, freeways should not connect to collectors or local streets.





B. Encouraged Activities

Activities described in the RTP that local jurisdictions are encouraged to pursue are:

1. Rideshare Programs - An attractive way to lessen peak period vehicle travel is to increase the percentage of commuters that rideshare. This serves to increase person-carrying capacity without increasing vehicle demand on the highways. Because of the relatively constant and repetitive nature, individuals can make shared ride arrangements of work trips in advance. Other trip purposes, such as shopping and recreational trips, have proven much less responsive to instituted rideshare programs and are, therefore, not addressed.

Currently, approximately 23 percent of those traveling to work by auto rideshare in groups of two or more on any given day. A few large firms in the region with aggressive rideshare programs have upwards of 30 percent of their employees ridesharing. Looking at the rideshare goals of some large firms in the region and at experiences in other cities, a regional objective of 35 percent of all individuals traveling to work by auto in the rideshare mode appears reasonable and achievable by the year 2000. If this goal is met, there would be a nine percent reduction in auto work trips in the year 2000 from what would be expected using the 1980 rideshare rate and an accompanying reduction in vehicle travel of 538,000 miles per day. This shift to ridesharing represents 16 percent fewer persons driving to work alone and 50 percent more persons traveling to work in carpools or vanpools.

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to adopt policies supporting the 35% rideshare target for work trips, such as:

- Concentrate rideshare efforts on work trips to large employers or employment centers and in congested traffic corridors.
 - Encourage ridesharing through incentives (such as preferential parking locations and price and preferential traffic lanes) and through marketing programs to advertise the benefits of ridesharing and to increase the convenience of ridesharing.
2. Parking Management - The mode of travel used to make a trip is directly influenced by the convenience and cost of parking. As parking in densely developed areas becomes less convenient and more costly, alternative modes of travel become more attractive. In addition, as alternative modes of travel are increasingly used for work trips, scarce parking spaces are released for shopping trips. Parking management is particularly important in

areas that are currently developed at high densities and in areas planned for new high density development. Parking management programs can be targeted at increasing both ridesharing and transit use depending upon the circumstances.

- Local jurisdictions are encouraged to limit the number of parking spaces in high density areas with direct service to regional transit trunk routes. The limit should be based upon the type and density of development and can be accomplished through a parking management program covering a general area or specific parking requirements for individual developments.
 - Local jurisdictions are encouraged to manage the price and location of parking to favor the rideshare and transit traveler and shopping trips rather than work trips by single-occupant autos.
 - Park-and-pool lot development is encouraged to aid in formation of carpools.
3. Land Use - Local jurisdictions are encouraged to initiate the following land use actions to support demand management programs:
- New development should achieve a balance of employment, shopping and housing to reduce the need for long trips and to make bicycle and pedestrian travel more attractive.
 - Employment opportunities should be developed throughout the metropolitan area in both urban and suburban locations. This development should be concentrated and located to maximize the feasibility of being served by transit or located along regional transit trunk routes. Employment, commercial and residential densities should be maximized around planned transit stations and regional transit trunk route stops and compatible high density land uses considered along sub-regional and local transit routes.
 - Pedestrian movements should be encouraged within major activity centers by clustering hotel, entertainment, residential, retail and office services to utilize common parking areas.
 - Land development patterns, site standards and densities which make transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel more attractive should be promoted.
 - Local jurisdictions should seek to improve the streetside environment affecting the transit user, bicyclist and pedestrian.
4. Flextime/Staggered Work Hours/Four-Day Work Week - Local jurisdictions are encouraged to support the following activities:

- Flexible work schedules are encouraged at all places of employment where such programs would not interfere with the productivity or effectiveness of the employee.
 - Flexible work schedules are particularly encouraged at large employment centers, in central business districts and in areas experiencing traffic and circulation problems.
5. Transitway Right-of-Way Reservation - Until such time as a definite decision to construct a transitway is made as a result of the EIS decision process described above, local jurisdictions are encouraged to work with developers to protect logical right-of-way opportunities from encroachment. Parcels that cannot be protected in this manner should be identified to Tri-Met for acquisition on a case by case basis.

C. Compliance Criteria

All local plans must demonstrate consistency with the RTP by December 31, 1983 or as part of their normal process of completing their plan or during the next regularly scheduled update. It is Metro's intent to work closely with jurisdictions over the two-year period to obtain consistency in a cooperative manner. A local plan shall be considered in compliance with the RTP if the following criteria are met:

1. It contains the specific items listed above as required for compliance; and
2. It does not contain any policies that directly conflict with those adopted in the RTP; and
3. It contains either:
 - a. policies which support, encourage or implement one or more of the activities listed above that local jurisdictions are encouraged to pursue; or
 - b. the local plan or the background materials adopted to support it contain an explanation of why none of the listed activities were considered feasible or appropriate for that jurisdiction.

After December 31, 1983 Metro's Regional Development Committee will review local plans for consistency. In specific cases where local plans (or future amendments) are determined to be inconsistent with the RTP, the specific inconsistency will be referred to JPACT for a recommendation. The subsequent Metro Council action could consist of any of the following recommendations:

1. a recommendation or requirement to change the local comprehensive plan's land use or transportation elements; and/or
2. an amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan; and/or
3. a recognition that the inconsistency exists, but that extenuating circumstances indicate that a plan change is not justified.

- The principal system should serve the major centers of activity (trip generators), the highest traffic volume corridors and the longest trip desires.
 - No restrictions on truck traffic.
2. Major Arterials - These facilities are the supporting elements of both the principal routes and collector systems. Major arterials, in combination with principal routes, are intended to provide a high level of mobility for travel within the region. All trips from one subarea through an adjacent subarea traveling to other points in the region should occur on a major arterial or principal route. Access to major port facilities should be provided by major arterials.

System Design Criteria

- Linkage with principal arterials, collectors and other major arterials.
 - Land access should be restricted to major traffic generators to the greatest extent possible; minor driveways should be consolidated on access frontage roads or side streets.
 - Signalized intersections should maintain high capacity for the major arterial with grade separations as needed.
 - A major arterial or principal route should provide direct service from one subarea through another to reach the next subarea. If more than one route is available, the more direct route will be designated unless through traffic is incompatible with surrounding properties. Peak travel times should not be significantly increased through use of indirect routes.
 - Truck route.
 - The principal routes and major arterial systems in total should comprise 5-10 percent of the total mileage and carry 40-65 percent of the total vehicle miles traveled.
3. Minor Arterials - The minor arterial system complements and supports the principal and major systems, but is primarily oriented toward travel within and between adjacent subareas. An adequate minor arterial system is needed to ensure that these movements do not occur on principal routes or major arterials. These facilities provide connections to major activity centers and provide access from the principal and major arterial systems into each subarea.

System Design Criteria

- Any land access should be oriented to public streets and major traffic generators; access to single family dwellings should be discouraged.

MEETING REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: April 28, 1982
7:30 p.m. at Metro

GROUP/SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan Public Meeting

PERSONS ATTENDING: Andy Cotugno, Terry Bolstad, James Giesecking, Peg Henwood, Metro.

Metro Councilors Charlie Williamson and Corky Kirkpatrick.

Sign up sheet attached.

MEDIA: None

SUMMARY:

Metro Councilors Charlie Williamson and Corky Kirkpatrick assisted Andy Cotugno in making the presentation on the RTP.

Questions and Issues:

- How did you compute gas consumption in the gas tax measure while gas consumption is decreasing with people driving small cars?
- When have gas tax increases ever passed? I would not assume Oregon's economic growth will increase in the near future. How much of the RTP involves increasing capacity on McLoughlin?
- Is the proposed gas tax increase to be used for maintenance only?
- Why doesn't the RTP address a plan for the flow of freight or access to rail yards?
- Isn't ODOT in charge of all highway projects? Why is Metro doing the RTP?
- What corridors are under study in the Westside and what is the expectation that either of the corridors will be needed in the next 20 years? I think Washington County will be the growth area and maybe they should have had the first light rail transit system.
- In costing out bus replacements, did you cost out electric buses versus diesel buses?
- Why is very little money being spent in the east Portland area? East Portland is getting slighted from your taking money from the Mt. Hood Freeway to make improvements on the west side.

- Why bring Hwy. 26 into 181st Avenue? (Bebe Rucker responded from Multnomah County)
- What is being done in Tigard from I-5 to King City?
- If you spend money on transit rather than enlarging McLoughlin Blvd. it would be more positive, people won't be able to drive cars forever.
- I think the Banfield should be extended to connect with the Westside proposed light rail.
- With the possibility of a new city in East Multnomah County will they have an opportunity to comment on transportation projects for the region?
- How much of a sales tax would be required to finance the RTP?
- We need to justify light rail on cost rather than ridership.
- Could Metro take over Tri-Met?
- John Frewing ~~████~~ referred to p. 8-4 and 8-5 paragraph 5, stating that the statement was too simple and we needed to elaborate more.
- Doug Allan submitted a written statement (attached).
- A written statement was submitted by the East Side Central Club (attached).

REPORT WRITTEN BY: Peg Henwood

COPIES TO: Andy Cotugno

PH/gl
5903B/D3

A G E N D A M A N A G E M E N T S U M M A R Y

TO: Metro Council
FROM: Executive Officer
SUBJECT: Adopting Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

I. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt ordinance adopting RTP as amended (see attached memo).
- B. POLICY IMPACT: The adoption of the RTP will provide the region with a coordinated strategy of improvements and policies to serve the year 2000 travel needs and promote economic development through a cost-effective combination of highway improvements, transit expansion and demand management programs.

TPAC, JPACT and the Regional Development Committee have reviewed and recommended adoption of the RTP with changes outlined on the attached memo.
- C. BUDGET IMPACT: None.

II. ANALYSIS:

- A. BACKGROUND: The recommended RTP represents many years of cooperative transportation planning efforts among Metro, Tri-Met, ODOT, the Port of Portland and local jurisdictions to achieve consensus on a cost-effective transportation improvement strategy to meet the year 2000 travel needs for the region.
- B. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Not adopting the Plan. Without an adopted RTP, the USDOT has the authority to decertify the region's transportation planning program. Such an action could result in a moratorium on the granting of federal transportation funds.
- C. CONCLUSION: Adoption of Ordinance.

JG/srb
6013B/107
06/10/82

4. Councilor Communications.

Presiding Officer stated confirmation of the Solid Waste Review Committee was due to come to the Council at this meeting; however, there was a problem with the selection of a chairman, so approval will be postponed until the July 1 Council meeting.

5. Consent Agenda.

The consent agenda for this meeting consisted of:

5.1 A-95 Review.

Motion that the consent agenda be approved; carried unanimously. (Kafoury/Kirkpatrick)

6.1 Resolution No. 82-337, For the Purpose of Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Incorporate Three Projects of Innovative Techniques and Methods in the Operation and Management of Public Transportation.

Motion that Resolution No. 82-337 be approved; carried unanimously. (Williamson/Kirkpatrick)

6.2 Resolution No. 82-338, For the Purpose of Authorizing Federal Funds for 16(b)(2) Special Transportation Projects and Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Motion that Resolution No. 82-338 be adopted; carried unanimously. (Williamson/Kafoury)

7.1 Public Hearing on Ordinance No. 82-135, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). (First Reading)

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 82-135. (Williamson/Kirkpatrick)

Geraldine L. Ball, representing DJB, Inc. and herself personally, reviewed with the Council her objection to changing the location of the S. Tigard portion of the N. Tigard-S. Tigard Interchange from the Alternate 2 design. At the suggestion of the Council, Ms. Ball was asked to arrange a meeting with Andy Cotugno to resolve the situation.

The following people testified in favor of the Regional Transportation Plan:

Larry Cole, representing the Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee;
Tom Walsh, representing the Oregon Transportation Commission;
Steve Dotterer, Chief Transportation Planner, City of Portland;
Lloyd Anderson, representing the Port of Portland;
Walter Monasch, representing the City of Gresham;
Winston Kurth, representing Clackamas County Dept. of Environmental Services; and

Caroline Miller, representing Multnomah County Board of Commissioners.

The Council also received the following letters in support of the RTP:

Jane Cease, Chair, House Transportation Committee, Oregon Legislative Assembly;
Vern Ryles, Dick Burnham, Earl Bolliger and Peter Fry of the Central Eastside Industrial Council;
Larry Cole, Chairman, Washington County Transportation Coordinating Committee;
Mildred Schwab, City of Portland Commissioner; and
Al Myers, Mayor of Gresham.

7.2 Public Hearing on Ordinance No. 82-137, An Ordinance Relating to Contested Case Procedures and Amending Metro Code Chapter 5.02. (First Reading)

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 82-137. (Deines/Schedeen)

Andy Jordan reviewed with the Council the proposed amendments to the contested case procedures.

General discussion by the Council.

Motion to amend the ordinance to allow for new evidence to be accepted by the Council at its discretion; (Williamson/Etlinger) passed by the following vote:

Yeas: Etlinger, Williamson, Schedeen, Banzer, Oleson.
Nays: Rhodes, Kafoury, Deines, Kirkpatrick.
Absent: Burton, Bonner Berkman.

There were no comments from the public on this matter.

7.3 Public Hearing on Ordinance No. 82-138, For the Purpose of Amending Appropriations, Increasing the Transfer from the Solid Waste and the Zoo Operating Funds to the General Fund, and Declaring an Emergency.

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 82-138 (Deines/Schedeen); carried by the following roll call vote:

Yeas: Couns. Banzer, Burton, Deines, Kafoury, Kirkpatrick, Oleson, Rhodes, Schedeen and Williamson.
Nays: None.
Absent: Couns. Berkman, Bonner and Etlinger.

There were no public comments during this hearing.

General discussion of the changes to the FY '82 Budget.

Rebecca Marshall, Financial Counsel, Clements & Marshall;
Phil Bogue, Managing Partner (ret.), Arthur Anderson & Co.;
Art Talow, Partner, Bolliger, Hampton & Tarlow, Attorneys;
Jim Durham, Sr. Vice President & General Counsel, Portland
General Electric;
Bob Elfers, Executive Director, Oregon State Bar;
Dr. Bill Holden, Oregon Health Sciences Center;
Vern Rifer, Development Manager, Moran Construction Co.;
Bill Ryan, Administrative Dean, Clackamas Community College.

Motion to confirm the appointments of the members of the Energy Recovery Review Task Force; carried unanimously.
(Schedeen/Williamson)

6.2 Ordinance No. 82-135, For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). (Second Reading)

Presiding Officer stated she received a letter from Ralph Wright, Chairman of the Economic Principles & Policies Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, expressing concern that the Plan has no mention of annual review and change. Presiding Officer introduced wording for an amendment to the RTP.

Motion to amend the Regional Transportation Plan, page 1, in the list of items titled "Adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan represents":

"Recognition of the need to update the Regional Transportation Plan to respond to changing growth trends, public attitudes, financial resources, and other socio-economic condition."

carried unanimously. (Schedeen/Kafoury)

Presiding Officer read letters received from Geraldine L. Ball, representing DJB, Inc., as well as herself personally, thanking Andy Cotugno for contacting the State Right-of-Way Department to assist in resolving their objections to the possibility of the Dept. of Transportation acquiring additional property.

Tom Pry, publisher of the Sellwood Bee, spoke in opposition to the RTP on the basis of what he feels is lack of consideration for the financing of the elements of the Plan.

General discussion of the Plan, the summary of testimony, and the amendment proposed by staff.

Motion to adopt staff's recommended amendment to the RTP Ordinance No. 82-135, Section 1, to read as follows:

"1. The Metropolitan Service District Regional Transportation Plan, dated March 1982, with the amendments set forth in a memorandum to Council from the Executive Officer dated June 10, 1982, copies of which are on file with the Clerk of the Council, is hereby adopted effective July 1, 1982."

carried unanimously. (Rhodes/Williamson)

A vote on the previous motion to adopt Ordinance No. 82-135, as amended, (Williamson/Kirkpatrick) indicated that the motion passed by the following roll call vote:

Yeas: Banzer, Bonner, Burton, Etlinger, Kirkpatrick,
Rhodes, Schedeen and Williamson.

Nays: Kafoury.

Absent: Berkman, Deines and Oleson.

Coun. Kafoury stated she voted in opposition to the RTP since she feels inadequate consideration has been given to energy supplies, telecommunications, and funding of the elements of the Plan.

6.1 Public Hearing on Ordinance No. 82-133, An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 81-105, Establishing Procedures for Locational Adjustments of the Metropolitan Service District's Urban Growth Boundary. (First Reading)

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 82-133. (Bonner/Etlinger)

Motion to adopt amendments to Ordinance No. 82-133, as outlined in memo from staff dated June 30, 1982; carried unanimously. (Bonner/Kirkpatrick)

Mark Greenfield of 1000 Friends of Oregon stated his organization's concern with land speculation created with the provision for trades of property outside the UGB for property inside the UGB. Mr. Greenfield also stated that Metro should consider adopting standards for major amendments to the UGB.

Coun. Kafoury stated it has been the policy of the Council not to increase the size of the UGB and if standards for major amendments are adopted, the Council will not be limiting the UGB size.

Kevin Hanway, attorney representing the Homebuilders' Association, stated that Metro should consider doing away with trades altogether, because of additional expenses incurred for developing properties.

General discussion.

6.3 Ordinance No. 82-137, An Ordinance Relating to Contested Case Procedures and Amending Metro Code Chapter 5.02. (Second Reading)

Andy Jordan reviewed his memo relating the proposed amendments allowing Council to accept new testimony at its discretion.

Motion to adopt the amendments to Ordinance No. 82-137, as stated in memo from General Counsel dated June 25, 1982 (Williamson/Kirkpatrick); carried by the following vote:



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

527 S.W. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

July 12, 1982

Rick Gustafson
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Metro Council

Cindy Banzer
PRESIDING OFFICER
DISTRICT 9

Bob Oleson
DEPUTY PRESIDING
OFFICER
DISTRICT 1

Charlie Williamson
DISTRICT 2

Craig Berkman
DISTRICT 3

Corky Kirkpatrick
DISTRICT 4

Jack Deines
DISTRICT 5

Jane Rhodes
DISTRICT 6

Betty Schedeen
DISTRICT 7

Ernie Bonner
DISTRICT 8

Bruce Etlinger
DISTRICT 10

Marge Kafoury
DISTRICT 11

Mike Burton
DISTRICT 12

Jane McGarvin
Clerk of the Board
Multnomah County Courthouse
1021 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 606
Portland, OR 97204

Dear Ms. McGarvin:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances
adopted by the Council of the Metropolitan Service
District on the date(s) indicated:

Ordinance No. 82-135 and Ordinance No. 82-137,
adopted July 1, 1982.

Please file these copies in the Metro ordinance files.

Sincerely,

Sue Haynes
Clerk of the Council



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

527 SW. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

July 12, 1982

Rick Gustafson
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Metro Council

Cindy Banzer
PRESIDING OFFICER
DISTRICT 9

Bob Oleson
DEPUTY PRESIDING
OFFICER
DISTRICT 1

Charlie Williamson
DISTRICT 2

Craig Berkman
DISTRICT 3

Corky Kirkpatrick
DISTRICT 4

Jack Deines
DISTRICT 5

Jane Rhodes
DISTRICT 6

Betty Schedeen
DISTRICT 7

Ernie Bonner
DISTRICT 8

Bruce Etlinger
DISTRICT 10

Marge Kafoury
DISTRICT 11

Mike Burton
DISTRICT 12

Mr. George Poppen
County Clerk
Clackamas County Courthouse
906 Main
Oregon City, OR 97045

Dear Mr. Poppen:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances
adopted by the Council of the Metropolitan Service
District on the date(s) indicated:

Ordinance No. 82-135 and Ordinance No. 82-137,
adopted July 1, 1982.

Please file these copies in the Metro ordinance files.

Sincerely,

Sue Haynes
Clerk of the Council



METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

527 SW. HALL ST., PORTLAND, OR. 97201, 503/221-1646

July 12, 1982

Rick Gustafson
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Metro Council

Cindy Banzer
PRESIDING OFFICER
DISTRICT 9

Bob Oleson
DEPUTY PRESIDING
OFFICER
DISTRICT 1

Charlie Williamson
DISTRICT 2

Craig Berkman
DISTRICT 3

Corky Kirkpatrick
DISTRICT 4

Jack Deines
DISTRICT 5

Jane Rhodes
DISTRICT 6

Betty Schedeen
DISTRICT 7

Ernie Bonner
DISTRICT 8

Bruce Etlinger
DISTRICT 10

Marge Kafoury
DISTRICT 11

Mike Burton
DISTRICT 12

Gordon Mulleneaux
Washington County Administrator
150 North First, Room 418
Hillsboro, OR 97123

Dear Mr. Mulleneaux:

Enclosed are true copies of the following ordinances
adopted by the Council of the Metropolitan Service
District on the date(s) indicated:

Ordinance No. 82-135 and Ordinance No. 82-157,
adopted July 1, 1982.

Please file these copies in the Metro ordinance files.

Sincerely,

Sue Haynes
Clerk of the Council