BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 00-2888A Introduced by Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, the November 5 draft of the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was approved by Council resolution on December 16, 1999; and

WHEREAS, the Council action included amendments to the draft, as recommended by JPACT and MPAC; and

WHEREAS, the Council resolution forwards additional comments received on the 1999 RTP during the public comment period to JPACT for review and supplemental recommendations; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED,

That the supplemental amendments contained in Exhibit A be incorporated with amendments to the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan approved by Council resolution on December 16, 1999.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 27th day of January, 2000.

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

C\Resolutions\2000\00-2888A

METRO

Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. 00-2888A

1999 Regional Transportation Plan

Part 1

Summary of Additional RTP Comments and TPAC Recommendations for

Approval by Discussion

Comment 1: Metro should jointly staff a task force with Tri-Met and other partners that would meet to consider and recommend ways to broaden and expand the scope of planning and consideration in the RTP for special needs transportation for elderly, disabled and low income individuals throughout the plan. (Multnomah County Aging and Disability Services, 12/14/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 1: TPAC agrees that this important issue needs additional consideration within the Regional Transportation Plan. Staff recommends working with Tri-Met, the area agencies on aging, TPAC and JPACT to develop recommendations for inclusion in the ordinance draft RTP in Spring 2000 or in a future update to the RTP.

In the interim, the following minor edit is needed to expand the scope of service providers beyond public transportation:

"Transit Service for Special Needs Populations

Public transportation service often provides the only available transportation service to many people in the region, including; students, the elderly, the economically disadvantaged, the mobility impaired and others with special needs. It is important that the ~~public~~ transportation service providers consider the special needs of those people who rely on <u>their services</u> ~~the providers~~ as their primary transportation option for access to jobs, job training and services."

Comment 2: The strategic system is too large to be useful for meaningful decisions and the financially constrained system will be too constrained to provide a vision for the future. Develop a fiscally responsible strategic system to provide a vision for future local and regional decisions. Together with the required financially constrained system, a more modest strategic system will provide the guidance needed to set priorities for the next twenty years. Propose that the RTP be changed by moving 160 transportation projects (about $2.9 billion) from the strategic to the preferred. (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation to Comment 2: This comment has already been addressed extensively by TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council. Refer to Exhibit B to Resolution No. 99-2878B, JPACT recommendations on comments 1 through 4. No change of projects from the strategic system to the preferred system is recommended. Metro staff will develop a Financially Constrained System for consideration by TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council prior to adoption by Ordinance in July

2000. During this period, staff will work with TPAC, JPACT and the Council to develop a financing plan for the strategic system, and projects in the strategic system may be scaled back if they exceed the revenue that could be generated by the financing plan.

Comment 3: Level of service measurements should be dropped from the RTP as the measure for how well the system is working. Currently this only measures how many cars are trying to get through a particular place at a particular time. It does not consider how many people are in the cars or what alternatives the people in those cars have available. (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation to Comment 3: Do not drop level of service (LOS) measurements from the RTP, since it is a reasonable measure of concern to the public and policy makers--congestion. In addition, the performance measures provided for in the RTP recognize situations where congestion is not the best measure and allow for the use of alternate measures. Refer also to comments 50 through 60 in *Exhibit B to Resolution 99-2878B* , where LOS and performance measures have already been extensively addressed. Also, section 6.5.3 of the draft plan includes benchmarks for evaluating progress toward implementing a fully multi-modal transportation system.

METRO

Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. 00-2888A

1999 Regional Transportation Plan

Part 2
Summary of Additional RTP Comments and TPAC Recommendations for

Approval by Consent

Comment 4: The strategic system should not be used as the basis for defining an "adequate" transportation system for future land use planning in the region when the region is unable to fund improvements to implement the system. (Larry Derr, 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 4: Retain the strategic system as the basis for defining an "adequate" transportation system. Refer to JPACT's recommendation on Comments 3 and 4 as summarized in *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items* and *Part 2, Council Consent Items*, Comment 68.

Comment 5: Additional work is needed to define a system that clearly defines how local governments can achieve the non-SOV targets, how Tri-Met will achieve these targets and how as a region we will achieve these targets. This additional work needs to be completed before adoption of the RTP. (City of Hillsboro, 12/2/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 5: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comment 7.

Comment 6: Amend Resolution No. 99-2878A as follows, "WHEREAS, Chapter 6 of this 1999 RTP Update and other information related to Chapter 6 should be considered a substantial statement of intent, but will require further analysis prior to adoption by Ordinance; now, therefore be it RESOLVED," Addition of this language will address concerns that other chapters of the RTP that contain policies, tables, maps or other requirements that are required to be implemented in Chapter 6 may be revised prior to adoption by ordinance. (City of Hillsboro, 12/2/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 6: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 7: Amend page 6-8 to read, "...Chapter 2 as applicable, 2020 Population and employment forecasts contained in Section 2.1 and 2.3, or alternative forecasts as provided for in Section 6.4.9 of this chapter" to allow cities and counties to use a different 2020 forecast than adopted in the RTP. (City of Hillsboro, 12/2/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 7: No change is recommended. The existing language currently provides some flexibility to allow a local jurisdiction to use a different 2020 population and employment forecast. In addition, refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Item*, Comments 64 and 65.

Comment 8: Concerned about clarity of what is required and cost of providing pedestrian crossings at major transit stops. How can major transit stops be designated without knowing where transit service will be provided? (City of Hillsboro, 12/2/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 8: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Item*, Comments 136 and 137.

Comment 9: The meaning and status of non-SOV targets is unclear, particularly with regard to the ability of local governments to meet them and what local benchmarks would be used to evaluate progress toward meeting the targets. (City of Hillsboro, 12/2/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 9: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comment 7 and *Part 2, Council Consent Item*, Comments 54, 70, 71 and 72 .

Comment 10: Amend Figure 1.14, Relationship between Regional Street Design and Motor Vehicle Classifications, to add "Community Street" and "Urban Road" as "most appropriate street design classification" circles for "Collector" streets. These changes cover situations where there are "collectors of regional significance" that are also designated as "Community Street" or "Urban Road." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 10: Agree. Amend as requested. In addition, add "Community Boulevard" and "Rural Road" as "most appropriate street design classification" circles for "Collector" streets.

Comment 11: Amend page 1-50, definition of "Transit/Mixed Use Corridor" to distinguish mixed-use corridors from transit corridors where pedestrian amenities are provided, but not as intensively developed with pedestrian amenities such as wide sidewalks. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 11: No change is recommended. The Transit/Mixed-Use Corridor designation is based on the "Corridor" designation on the 2040 Growth Concept map and is intended to reflect priority areas for pedestrian improvements to support regional bus service designated on the Regional Public Transportation System Map.

Comment 12: Amend all the RTP system maps shown in Chapter 1 as follows:

- Using the "Hillsboro 2040 Growth Concept Boundaries Map", correct the locations of the Orenco Town Center, Tanasbourne Town Center and the Industrial Areas (on the east side of Cornelius Pass Road on the south side of US 26 and east of Brookwood Parkway on the north side of Airport Road).

- Remove the Urban Reserve designation for Segawa property, which is located at the SE corner of the intersection of Cornelius Pass and West Union Roads as it has been brought into the UGB.

- Correct the alignment of Jacobson Road from Helvetia Road to Cornelius Pass Road.

(City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 12: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 13: Amend Figure 1.12: Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to change the classification of NE 25th Avenue from Cornell Road to Evergreen Road from a "Collector of Regional Significance" to a "Minor Arterial." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 13: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 14: Amend Figure 1.12: Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to add NE 28th Avenue from E. Main Street to Cornell Road as a "Minor Arterial." This street connects a designated main street with the Fair Complex LRT Station. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 14: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 15: Amend Figure 1.12: Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to add SE Minter Bridge Road, SE Cypress Street and SE 32nd Avenue from the urban growth boundary to E. Main Street as "Minor Arterials." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 15: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 16: Amend Figure 1.12: Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to add 229th Avenue from Jacobson Road to West Union as a dashed "Collector of Regional Significance." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 16: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 17: Amend Figure 1.12: Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to change the designation for SE Witch Hazel Road from a "Minor Arterial" to a "Collector of Regional Significance." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 17: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 18: Remove Tualatin Valley Highway recommendations from the RTP, including the proposal to downgrade Tualatin Valley highway to "Major Arterial" status within the Beaverton regional center. (Steve Larrance, 12/7/99 and 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 18: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comment 12, and *Part 2, Council Consent Item*, Comment 88.

Comment 19: Revise Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor Study discussion on page 6-31 to read,

"A number of improvements are need in this corridor to address existing deficiencies and serve increased travel demand. The primary function of this route is to provide access to and between the Beaverton and Hillsboro regional centers~~.~~ and move significant volumes of east-west traffic through a corridor bounded by Baseline Road to the north and Farmington Road to the south. As such, the corridor is defined as extending from Farmington Road~~,~~ in Beaverton, to Baseline Road~~,~~ in Hillsboro. The following design considerations should be addressed as part of a corridor study:

- consider aggressively managing access as part of a congestion management strategy
- ~~implement~~ consider TSM and other interim intersection improvements at various locations between Cedar Hills Boulevard and Brookwood Avenue
- ~~implement long-term~~ consider a limited access, divided facility from Murray Boulevard to Brookwood Avenue~~,~~ with three lanes in each direction. ~~and grade separation~~ Also consider alternatives to grade separation at major intersections.
- ~~Implement~~ consider complementary capacity improvements on parallel routes~~,~~ including Farmington, Alexander, Baseline and Walker roads."

(City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 19: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comment 12, and *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Item*, Comment 88. However, TPAC does recommend a clarification of the corridor study boundaries on page 6-31, as follows:

"A number of improvements are need in this corridor to address existing deficiencies and serve increased travel demand. One primary function of this route is to provide access to and between the Beaverton and Hillsboro regional centers. TV Highway also serves as an access route to Highway 217 from points west along the TV Highway corridor. As such, the corridor is defined as extending from Cedar Hills Boulevard on the east to 10th Avenue in Hillsboro on the west, and from Baseline/Jenkins roads on the north, to Farmington Road on the south. ~~Farmington Road, in Beaverton, to Baseline Road, in Hillsboro~~. The following design considerations should be addressed as part of a corridor study:

Comment 20: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to add NE 28th Avenue from E. Main Street to Cornell Road as a "Community Street." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 20: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 21: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to revise designation for Cornell Road from Baseline Road to NE 25th Avenue from a "Highway" to a "Regional Street". (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 21: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 22: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to revise designation of Baseline Road from SW 197th Avenue to 185th Avenue from a "Community Boulevard" to a "Community Street" due to the low density of this area. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 22: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 23: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to revise designations of John Olson Avenue and Stucki Avenue between Amberwood/Walker Road and Evergreen Parkway from "Urban Roads" to "Community Streets." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 23: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 24: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to revise designation of 206th Avenue between Quatama Street and Baseline Road from an "Urban Road" to a "Community Street." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 24: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 25: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to add segment of 229th Avenue from Jacobson Road to West Union Road as a dashed "Urban Road." (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 25: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 26: Amend Figure 1.4: Regional Street Design System Map to add SE Minter Bridge Road, SE Cypress Street and SE 32nd Avenue as "Community Street" from UGB to E. Main Street. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 26: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 27: Add regional bus routes to the following streets on Figure 1.16, Regional Public Transportation System Map, to increase the amount of regional transit service in Washington County:

- Brookwood Avenue/Brookwood Parkway/Shute Road from Tualatin Valley Highway to West Union Road.
- Century Boulevard/231st Avenue/229th Avenue from Davis Road to West Union.
- Cornelius Pass Road from SE 209th Avenue intersection (showed as dashed line through the South Hillsboro Urban Reserve) to West Union Road.
- Cypress Street/32nd Avenue/28th Avenue/25th Avenue from Tualatin Valley Highway to Evergreen Road.
- Evergreen Road/Evergreen Parkway from Jackson School Road to Cornell Road
- Farmington Road from 209th Avenue to 185th Avenue.
- Jacobson Road from Helvetia Road to Cornelius Pass Road, then heading east on West Union Road.
- Kinnaman Road from 209th Avenue to 185th Avenue.
- River Road/Davis Road from Minter Bridge Road to 209th Avenue.
- NE 5th Avenue/Jackson School Road from Baseline Street to Evergreen Road.
- 205thAvenue/206th Avenue/John Olson Avenue from Baseline Road to Evergreen Parkway.
- 209th Avenue from Cornelius Pass Road (where it intersects 209th Avenue from the South Hillsboro Urban Reserve) to Farmington Road.

(City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 27: No change is recommended. In Figure 1.16, regional bus service is tied to 2040 "corridor" or "main street" designations on the adopted 2040 Growth Concept map. The proposed regional bus routes are not designated as "Corridors" or "Main Streets" on the 2040 Growth Concept map. In addition, the Regional Public Transportation System map is not intended to preclude operating local transit service on these streets.

The quality of proposed RTP transit service in corridors and main streets was determined in a two-step process. First, all areas with these 2040 designations are assumed to have high quality transit service in the long term, by definition. Such service was then modeled and evaluated for cost effectiveness according to the expected level of development in these areas over the 20-year time frame of the RTP. In some corridors, the level of development is not expected to support regional-level transit during that time period, and community bus is proposed in the interim.

However, TPAC will consider adding these routes to the Regional Public Transportation System map as part of the Ordinance version of the RTP based on Hillsboro comprehensive plan changes to current local land use designations in support of regional bus service.

Comment 28: Amend Figure 1.19, Regional Pedestrian System Map, to distinguish between purely mixed-use corridors (with residential) and transit corridors which serve primarily commercial/industrial development (like Tualatin Valley Highway). (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 28: No change is recommended. The Transit/Mixed-Use Corridor designation is based on the "Corridor" designation on the 2040 Growth Concept map and is intended to reflect priority areas for pedestrian improvements to support regional bus service designated on the Regional Public Transportation System Map.

Comment 29: Amend Figure 1.19, Regional Pedestrian System Map, to reflect the alignment of the Rock Creek multi-use trail as shown in adopted Hillsboro TSP and reflect the already completed sections of this multi-use trail as solid lines. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 29: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 30: Amend Figure 1.19, Regional Pedestrian System Map, to reflect the delineation of pedestrian districts in Figure 5-2 in adopted Hillsboro TSP. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 30: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 31: Amend Figure 1.19, Regional Pedestrian System Map, to designate Hillsboro regional center and Tanasbourne and Orenco town centers as pedestrian districts. Main Street in the general vicinity of NE 28th Avenue and E. Main Street should also be shown. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 31: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 32: Page 5-69, revise alignment of Project #3153 (David Hill Road Connection) to reflect alignment proposed in City of Forest Grove TSP. (Mayor Kidd, Forest Grove, 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 32: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 33: Add an interim project to the strategic system on Garden Home Road to build bicycle lanes and sidewalks from Oleson Road to Allen Boulevard. (CPO#3, 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 33: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 34: Pages 3-60, 3-61, 3-68, amend the commuter rail language to reflect the following conclusion, "Overall, commuter rail is expected to be an important part of the modal mix of improvements for this part of the region because it offers separate right-of-way for transit service in a corridor that is expected to experience congestion during the morning and evening two-hour peak period." (Metro staff, 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 34: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 35: Recommend that Tri-Met bring their service plans through Metro as part of the regional TDM program. (City of Hillsboro, 12/3/99 and 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 35: This request will be forwarded to Tri-Met for consideration.

Comment 36: Revise cost of Project #1029 (Water Avenue Extension) to be $250,000. (City of Portland, 12/3/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 36: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 37: Add new project #1047 (SE 7-8thAvenue Connection) to RTP Strategic System in 2006-2010 timeframe to reflect recommendations from Central Eastside Transportation Study. (City of Portland, 12/3/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 37: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 38: Revise Tables 2.7, 3.6, 5.2 and 5.9 and the corresponding discussion of these tables be updated to reflect the following data:

INTRA-UGB

	1994	No Build	Existing Resources	Strategic System	Preferred System
Congested Freeway Miles (as percentage of Total Freeway Miles with v/c >0.9)	14.9%	36.7%	35.8%	26.6%	28.6%
Congested Arterial Miles (as percentage of Total Arterial Miles with v/c >0.9)	6.0%	24.6%	23.5%	16.3%	15.3%
Congested Total Miles (as percentage of Total Miles with v/c >0.9)	6.6%	25.4%	24.4%	17.0%	16.3%

(Metro staff, 12/13/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 38: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 39: Advocating for a new community-based transit planning process, using computer-model data feedback, to develop a transit network which provides more coverage of the region and allows for more timed transfers at community, town and regional centers. Need better use of information technology to provide real-time information for transit users waiting for transit service to arrive. (John Miller, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 39: The transit component of the strategic transportation network provides several pieces of the community-based transit network being proposed while also investing in proven radial transit routes. It includes new coverage to areas of the region currently without fixed-route transit service (31 percent of proposed new service). It also includes more investment in existing service that is not radial oriented into the central city but oriented to transit centers in regional and town centers, allowing for timed-transfers and serving community -oriented land uses, such as main streets, along those transit routes.

It also proposes substantial investment in improving and creating new transit centers throughout the region. Part of these proposed improvements include real-time information technology at transit centers and along the regional transit routes to relieve the uncertainty of waiting customers.

Tri-Met is now doing more detailed service planning to define changes to implement during the next ten years within the Regional Transportation Plan 20-year plan period.

Comment 40: Abandon projects that increase capacity between regional centers - they increase costs beyond available revenues and encourage more driving. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and Coalition For a Livable Future (CLF), 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 40: For regional centers to be successful as a way to manage growth in the region, it is important to provide multi-modal access to and from the regional centers and their service areas.

Comment 41: Focus funds on making getting around within regional and town centers easier. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and CLF, 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 41: The RTP includes a new focus on identifying multi-modal projects within regional and town centers that make getting around in those centers more attractive for pedestrians, bicyclist and transit users. The RTP does not prioritize funding among projects identified within the strategic system.

Comment 42: Define zoning and other land use plans and pricing measures to bring businesses to existing residential centers, and residences to business centers, and tie this to funding. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 42: The RTP does not define zoning; this is the responsibility of the region's cities and counties. It does provide policy guidance on how to serve defined land uses with transportation facilities of regional significance. These policies do encourage mixing land uses to achieve transportation goals and prioritizing transportation investments in those areas that provide mixed land uses.

Comment 43: The Strategic System is too large. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 43: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1 Council Discussion Items*, Comment 3.

Comment 44: The Strategic System has much less transit than the Preferred System, while road projects are not cut proportionately. This should be reversed, with transit solutions given priority before new road capacity is added. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 44: The purpose of the RTP is to define a transportation system that is adequate to meet local, state and federal goals and regulations regarding transportation facilities. That is the purpose of the strategic system and any proportionality to the Preferred system (a list of desirable projects to fully meet goals) is irrelevant. Furthermore, the strategic system represents a 194 percent increase in average weekday transit revenue hours and a 16 percent increase in roadway lane miles from 1994.

Regional funding priorities are defined during the biannual Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) process. The MTIP is a public process that develops technical and administrative criteria for ranking the merits of each project being considered for funding. To be eligible for funding, the project must be included in the RTP financially constrained system and comply with federal clean air regulations.

Comment 45: The plan fails to identify specific solutions for transportation corridors in some existing communities and does not identify priorities for developing those solutions. The consequence will be funding for defined but lower priority projects at the urban edge. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 45: The RTP does not propose specific solutions where further study is needed to develop agreement on what projects and strategies are needed to address transportation issues. This implies no order of priority of other, more defined projects, relative to a corridor study and its subsequent projects.

Comment 46: The proposed RTP will substantially increase the risk that we will fall into air quality non-attainment. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and CLF, 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 46: As stated in section 3.5.1, demonstration of conformity of budgeted levels for the Portland metropolitan area air shed for the transportation sector will be completed after the RTP is adopted by resolution in December 1999. Amendments to the RTP may be triggered if the demonstration cannot be made.

Comment 47: The plan should make maintenance and preservation of the existing system its first priority. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and CLF, 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 47: Maintenance and preservation of the existing road system is provided by ODOT and the cities and counties of the region and largely funded through state-collected auto and truck fees. While the RTP is a plan for an adequate capital system, the financial analysis provided in chapter 4 and section 5.4 recognize the need of ODOT, cities and counties to maintain their road systems and that maintenance competes for funding with modernization projects. The RTP demonstrates what is necessary to fund both operation and maintenance of the existing system and then new capital projects identified in the plan.

Prioritization of spending of city and county transportation funds is made through processes at each of those jurisdictions. Prioritization of regional funding is made through the MTIP process as described above.

Comment 48: Numerous small improvements should be implemented before single large, expensive solutions are adopted. In many cases better results can be obtained from better connectivity of local streets than from large increases in capacity. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and CLF, 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 48: Providing local street connectivity to preserve operating capacity on the regional street network is an identified policy in the RTP with subsequent regulations for underdeveloped residential and mixed-use areas. See sections 1.3.2 and 6.4.5 for a detailed description of RTP policies and regulations on local street connectivity.

Comment 49: The plan fails to adequately address environmental concerns of adding road capacity. These include the impact on endangered salmon from bridges over salmon streams, run-off from roads and parking. (Sierra Club, 12/6/99 *and CLF, 12/15/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 49: The RTP only plans for the transportation network in public right-of-way, not off-street parking facilities. However, additional work is needed to address environmental impacts of road and bridge improvements identified in the RTP. Metro recently received a planning grant for the *Green Streets* project. This project will look at the conflicts between good transportation design, expected growth and the need to protect streams and wildlife corridors from urban impacts. The project will propose new regional connectivity standards tailored to urban reserves, inventory culverts in the region and create a handbook that recommends best practices and street design solutions that protect the environment.

Comment 50: Would like to see more emphasis given to Town Centers to deal with development pressures. Specifically, add language to section 3.4.3 addressing transportation needs and deficiencies in the Fairview/Wood Village, Troutdale and Rockwood town centers. (East Multnomah County Transportation Committee, 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 50: Add language describing the improvements of the preferred system, and develop findings and conclusions for a new subsection titled **"Other Centers"** in section 3.4.3 to address issues in the Fairview/Wood Village, Troutdale and Rockwood town centers.

Comment 51: North/South traffic movement (in East Multnomah County) needs to be addressed in the near term in both the RTP and MTIP process. This includes a number of substandard railroad over-crossings and the I-84 to US 26 connector. (East Multnomah County Transportation Committee, 12/7/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 51: There are several railroad crossing improvements included in the strategic system for East Multnomah County, including crossings at162nd, 202nd, and 223rd Avenues. There are also several improvements included in the strategic system to phase in an improved connection between I-84 and US 26 along Hogan Road and 242nd Avenue. These improvements and others included in the strategic system are adequate to address south/north transportation needs in east Multnomah County.

Comment 52: Would like JPACT to address funding strategies for the strategic system in conjunction with MPAC funding sub-committee. (East Multnomah County Transportation Committee 12/7/99, Multnomah County 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 52: This issue has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comments 3 and 4.

Comment 53: The strategic system project list should be revisited to provide a system that is closer to our economic reality. (Multnomah County, 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 53: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1 Council Discussion Items*, Comments 3 and 4.

Comment 54: While the Traffic Relief Options study suggested to JPACT that congestion pricing only be used to pay for new infrastructure, the RTP should not rule out using this tool to fund other projects. It should be considered for all new projects, including any new capacity built on Interstate 5. (Multnomah County, 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 54: The TRO study recommends that tolling or peak-period pricing be analyzed as an option in locations where the RTP calls for new highway capacity in congested corridors. There are a large number of spot improvements and arterial projects that do not lend themselves to pricing. However, improvements to I-5 are recommended for peak period pricing consideration.

Comment 55: Chapter 1: Regional Transportation Policy; Figure 1.18: Regional Bicycle System Map. Please make the following corrections or additions to the map: Bike lanes on NE 25th Avenue only go up to the entrance of Jones Farm, show the rest as proposed to Evergreen Road. (City of Hillsboro, 12/1/1999)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 55: The Regional Bicycle System Map is a functional map. The map does not include design treatments such as bike lanes. A map showing existing and planned bicycle improvements will be incorporated into Chapter 3, and will address the above comment.

Comment 56: Chapter 1: Regional Transportation Policy; Figure 1.18: Regional Bicycle System Map. Please make the following corrections or additions to the map:

- Add NE 28th Avenue from E. Main Street to Cornell Road as a "Community Connector" as it connects a main street with a station area. This is a planned project.
- Add Century Boulevard/234th Avenue/231st Avenue as a proposed "Community Connector" from Tualatin Highway to Baseline Road.
- Add Butler Road from Brookwood Parkway to Shute Road as a proposed "Community Connector" and from Shute Road to Cornelius Pass Road as a "Community Connector."
- Add 205th Avenue/206th Avenue from Baseline Road to Cornell Road as "Regional Access" as it connects a Station Community with Tanasbourne Town Center.
- Add Amberglen Parkway from Walker Road to 206th Avenue/LRT as a proposed "Community Connector".
- The alignment of the Rock Creek multi-use trail is shown incorrectly especially to the north and near Tualatin Valley Highway. Please refer to your copy of our adopted TSP for the correct alignment. Also reflect the already completed sections as solid lines. The delineation of pedestrian districts needs to match our designated pedestrian districts per our "Pedestrian Master and Pedestrian Action Plans" contained within our adopted TSP. Please refer to your copy of our adopted TSP for the correct pedestrian districts delineation. (City of Hillsboro, December 2, 1999)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 56: Agree. In the fourth bullet, the regional bikeway function would be Community Connector" rather than "Regional Access."

Comment 57: Defer projects 5086, 5211 and 5212 so more critical projects can go forward. Projects 5211 and 5212 may not be necessary. (Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 57: Project 5086 (82nd Ave. Multi-Modal Improvements) is in the Clackamas Regional Center Plan and has been adopted by Clackamas County. Project 5211 (Scott Creek Lane Pedestrian Improvements) was submitted by Happy Valley during the Priorities 2000 Process, and is an MTIP approved project. Project 5212 already includes bike lanes and sidewalks on Mountain View Road/137th Avenue from 129th Avenue to King Road, and can be deleted from the RTP project list.

Comment 58: Bicycle projects 7009, 7010 and 7011 should be deleted; they are not justified due to small benefit and steep grades. (Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 58: Bicycle projects 7009, 7010 and 7011 are in Clackamas County's adopted Bicycle Master Plan. Project 7011 (Monner Road) helps provide east/west bicycle system connectivity.

Comment 59: Add 134th/Deardorff/132nd from SE Foster to King Road to the Regional Bicycle System. (Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 59: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 60: Add William Otty Road Extension (from I-205 frontage road to Valley View Terrace) and SE Otty Road (from Valley View Terrace to SE 129th Street) to the Regional Bicycle System. (Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 60: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 61: Revise the timing and phasing of the following projects to be earlier in the strategic system time frames:

- 5066 (widening of Sunnyside Road; 122nd to 172nd Avenues)
- 7008 (147th realignment)
- 5071 (Otty Road extension; I-205 to Valley View Terrace)
- 5208 (Idleman Road to Johnson Creek Blvd.)

(Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 61: Do not change timing and phasing of projects 5066 and 5208 on the RTP project list at this time. Projects 5071 and 7008 are tied to development in Happy Valley and Clackamas County. As development occurs and local funding becomes available, projects 5071 and 7008 could be completed at an earlier date.

Although much work is needed to fully plan transportation facilities in this rapidly growing part of the region, the overall project list and proposed phasing of project 5066 and 5208 reflects current funding priorities and realities in Clackamas County and the region. However, Clackamas County staff has indicated that a number of projects in this area will be discussed locally in the coming months, and may be revised in the adoption draft of the RTP.

Comment 62: Add the new 147th Avenue alignment (project 7008) to the Regional Bicycle System. (Mayor Grant, Happy Valley, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 62: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 63: In light of severely constrained finances, Metro should be focusing its efforts on increasing mobility for the region's residents at the lowest possible cost. This means shifting investment priorities toward projects that improve multi-modal levels of service. The Bicycle Transportation Alliance urges JPACT to revise the Project List to prioritize projects that increase local connectivity and improve access for cyclists and pedestrians. While the Preferred system does contain projects that substantially improve bicycle access and increase local connectivity, the revenues needed to actually build the system are far beyond the region's reach. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 63: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comments 3 and 4.

Comment 64: The Caruthers Bike/Pedestrian Bridge (RTP #1077) is tied to South-North Light Rail funding. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 64: Agree. Revise language to indicate that Project 1077 is tied to the South-North light rail project and should not be listed in the RTP as a "stand-alone" bicycle/pedestrian bridge project.

Comment 65: The Morrison Bridge bicycle access project (RTP #1062) should be moved up in time to 2000-2005, as it was the highest-ranked bicycle project in the 1999 MTIP process. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 65: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 66: Existing Resource Concept (page 5-2, RTP project list). This system absolutely fails to meet Metro's stated commitment to increasing multi-modal transportation options in the metropolitan region. Its failure is particularly acute in relation to bicycles. Out of fewer than 20 bicycle projects identified in the list, approximately half are City of Portland projects and several of the identified projects have already been funded. This list reflects virtually no regional commitment to increasing bicycle access in coming years, despite Metro's stated policies to the contrary. At a minimum, the following projects should be prioritized to receive funding:

#1009 Springwater Trail Access Improvements – critical north/south connection for bicycles along the east side of the Willamette River

#1062 WRBAP/Morrison Bridge Bicycle Pathway – top-ranked bicycle project in the 1999 MTIP process

1065 N. Interstate Bikeway – Essential bicycle connectivity in relation to the Interstate MAX line

#1069 East Burnside Bikeway

#1143 N/NE Lombard Bikeway – critical connection to Interstate MAX line

#1144 N. Portland Rd. Bikeway – critical connection to Interstate MAX line

#1169 SW Vermont Bikeway – provide access and connection where there currently is none

#1175 SW Capitol Highway Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements – key access

#1177 SW Sunset Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements – key access

#1213 NE/SE 122nd Avenue Bikeway - critical connection to Interstate MAX line

#1258 N/NE Skidmore Bikeway – critical connection to Interstate MAX line

#2053 Gresham/Fairview Trail – key cross-town bicycle connection between two well-used routes in a place where bicycle access is extremely difficult

#2054 Springwater Trail connections – leverage this outstanding bicycle corridor

#3012 Rock Creek Greenway Multi-use Path – critical access in an area with poor bicycle/pedestrian access

#3013Bronson Creek Greenway Multi-Use Path – critical access in an area with poor bicycle/pedestrian access

#3014 Powerline Beaverton Trail Corridor Trail – critical access in an area with poor bicycle/pedestrian access

#3015 Beaverton Creek Greenway Corridor Study – critical access in an area with poor bicycle/pedestrian access

#3045 Farmington Road Bikeway – critical access in an area with poor bicycle access

#3046 Hall Boulevard Bikeway – critical access in an area with poor bicycle access

#3047 Watson Avenue Bikeway – critical access in an area with poor bicycle access

#3055 Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements - critical access in an area with poor bicycle access

3071 Fanno Creek Greenway Multi-Use Path – this is a high-priority project that will create superb regional access in an area that is less and less pedestrian- and bicycle-accessible

#3073 Hall Boulevard Bikeway - critical access in an area with poor bicycle access

#3078 Canyon Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements – provide much-needed bicycle and pedestrian access

#3098 Walker Road Bike/Ped Improvements

#4074 Rivergate Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail – key bicycle connection to improve transportation benefits of the 40-Mile Loop trail

#5026 Portland Traction Co. Multi-Use Trail – important trail connection in an area of difficult bicycle and pedestrian access

#5089 Sunnyside Road Bikeway

#5091 Causey Avenue Bikeway

#5165 Willamette Greenway Path – key bicycle access

#6051 Hall Boulevard Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements

#6077 Tualatin-Sherwood Road Bikeway

#6081 Nyberg Road Pedestrian and Bike Improvements

#8000 Bicycle Travel Demand Forecasting Model – essential planning tool to prioritize bicycle investments (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 66: No change is recommended. The Existing Resource System represents just one example of how limited revenues might be spent in this region for the purposes of analyzing the impact of no new revenue on the operation of the regional transportation system and implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. This system is not a policy statement of where transportation improvements should be directed if no new revenues are identified during the 20-year plan period.

A number of the projects listed above are included as high priority projects (2000-2005) in the Strategic System. Metro staff will develop a Financially Constrained System prior to adoption of the RTP by Ordinance in July 2000. Therefore, the projects listed above will receive consideration as the Financially Constrained project list is developed.

Comment 67: Strategic System. As with the preferred system, it appears that the Strategic System far outstrips available resources. Metro's Strategic System should reflect investment priorities that allow residents to choose walking or bicycling as an accessible, convenient and universally-available alternative to using an automobile to meet daily transportation needs. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 67: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" Part 1, Council Discussion Items*, Comments 3 and 4.

Comment 68: A disproportionate number of the bicycle projects included on the Strategic System list are located in Portland. Bicycle projects dropped from the Preferred list tend to be stand-alone bicycle, pedestrian and trail projects (not connected to road widening) located in suburban jurisdictions. This will severely limit those jurisdictions' ability to give residents the option of bicycling or walking as an alternative means of getting around in their community. At a minimum, the Strategic System should include the following projects in addition to those outlined in the current plan:

#1143 N/NE Lombard Bikeway – critical connection to Interstate MAX
#1259 N/NE Skidmore Bikeway – critical connection to Interstate MAX
#3078 Canyon Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
#3079 Allen Boulevard Bike/Ped Projects
#6135 Boones Ferry Road Bike Lanes

(Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 68: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 69: Policy 13.0 Regional Motor Vehicle System. Revise language of objective (d) to prioritize local streets that increase connectivity over arterial improvements that add motor vehicle capacity. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 69: No change is recommended.

Comment 70: Policy 16.0 Regional Bicycle System. Include objectives for system completion (i.e., 80% by 2005, 90% by 2010; 95% by 2015; 100% by 2020), recognizing that a partially completed system provides severely limited mobility. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 70: Agree with proposed approach. This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Items,* Comments 70, 71 and 72. This issue is addressed in revisions to Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3. Additional objectives to Policy 16.0 are not necessary. In addition, it is premature to set benchmarks for each mode because Metro does not have a complete inventory of the existing infrastructure. Metro intends to complete this inventory as part of post-resolution activities.

Comment 71: Policy 16.0 Regional Bicycle System. Include objective: ensure that development of other mode systems (i.e., transit, motor vehicle) does not eliminate existing bicycle access or system components. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 71: Additional objective is not necessary, as Policy 16.0 and Objectives (a) and (b) sufficiently respond to the comment.

Comment 72: Policy 20.1 Transportation Finance: Recommendation: Add objective: (e) Place lowest priority on projects that expand auto-oriented road capacity at the edges of the region. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance, 11/23/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 72: Do not add the above objective to Policy 20.1. Existing policy and objectives sufficiently respond to the comment.

Comment 73: Do not locate a regional bicycle and pedestrian path in the Fanno Creek Greenway that is planned for Fanno Creek, adjacent to the single family homes in the Montclair neighborhood. Do connect your regional paths to other existing, or planned for on-street paths in the area. (Pat McGuinn, 11/22/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 73: Implementation of this project has been controversial for a number of years. Metro Park and Greenspaces, City of Beaverton, Tualatin Parks and Recreation District, neighborhood residents and businesses are currently working toward a solution that is acceptable to all affected parties. Designation of the Fanno Creek Multi-use Path on the Regional Bicycle System map and Regional Pedestrian System map should not be changed at this time.

Comment 74: Opposes any designation changes that would affect McLoughlin Boulevard in the area from Division Street to Powell Boulevard. Changing the designation to allow higher speeds would result in dire effects to the Brooklyn Neighborhood. (Brooklyn Action Corps, 12/3/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 74: McLoughlin Boulevard is important to a number of transportation modes in the region. RTP system map designations in Chapter 1 reflect current function and speed of McLoughlin Boulevard. McLoughlin Boulevard from Division Street to Powell Boulevard is designated on RTP system functional maps in Chapter 1 as follows:

- Regional Street Design System map: highway
- Regional Motor Vehicle System map: principal arterial (highway)
- Regional Public Transportation System map: potential light rail or rapid bus
- Regional Freight System map: main roadway route
- Regional Bicycle System map: regional corridor bikeway
- Regional Pedestrian System map: no designation

The designation of McLoughlin Boulevard south of Powell Boulevard emphasizes a more limited-access facility.

Comment 75: A project underway, the McLoughlin Boulevard viaduct north of the Ross Island Bridge, does not allow for two-way pedestrian and bicycle access. (Brooklyn Action Corps, 12/3/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 75: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Items,* Comment 89.

Comment 76: Consider revising Policy 19.0 Regional Transportation Demand Management to take a broader view of TMAs. Amend the following objective to read:
d. Objective: Promote, establish and support ~~Promote the establishment of~~ transportation management associations (TMAs) in the central city, regional centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities, town centers and employment centers. (Western Transportation Alliance, 12/6/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 76: Agree, amend policy language as requested. Note that the objective is to promote, establish and support TMAs in concept and does not define funding responsibility. TMAs compete for regional funding with other programs and projects through the MTIP process.

Comment 77: Amend the following objective under Policy 19.2 on page 1-56 to read, "b. Objective: ...Do not price existing roadways at this time, but peak period pricing on existing roadways should be considered as public support grows and demand necessitates." (Oregon Environmental Council, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 77: No change is recommended. Objective b., as currently written, reflects the Traffic Relief Options Study recommendations. However, Metro is required to update the RTP every 3 to 5 years. All policies will be re-evaluated as part of each update process and revised as appropriate to reflect changing conditions.

Comment 78: Amend the following objective under Policy 19.2 on page 1-56 to read, "a. Objective: Apply peak period pricing appropriately to manage congestion and, secondarily, to generate revenues to help with needed transportation improvements." (Oregon Environmental Council, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 78: Amend objective a. as follows, ""a. Objective: Apply peak period pricing appropriately to manage congestion. In addition, peak period pricing may ~~and~~ generate revenues to help with needed transportation improvements." to reflect the TRO TAC recommendations.

Comment 79: Amend description of project #5195 to read, "Retrofit the street with a boulevard design from West A Street to the existing Oregon City bridge..." to eliminate confusion as to the location of the project. (City of West Linn, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 79: **Agree.** Amend as requested.

Comment 80: Amend description of project #5194 to read, "Improve the intersections with Pimlico Drive to be safer for all modes of travel ~~to address safety and capacity issues~~." Intersection improvements at Failing and Jolie Pointe have been completed. (City of West Linn, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 80: **Agree.** Amend as requested.

Comment 81: Amend description of project #5204 to add a sentence at the end, "This project will include construction of a traffic signal." (City of West Linn, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 81: **Agree.** Amend as requested.

Comment 82: Concerned that transit service is not proposed for the Highway 213 corridor. (City of Oregon City, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 82: No change to the proposed transit system is recommended, although this does not preclude Tri-Met from providing local transit service on this facility. At this time, however, there are no land uses to serve along Highway 213, between I-205 and Beavercreek Road. The hilltop area near Beavercreek Road, including Clackamas Community College, is served by a regional bus route and community bus service that connects this area to the Oregon City transit center. When rail transit or rapid bus service is extended to Oregon City, a study of how to reorient the bus feeder network may consider service on Highway 213 to connect the hilltop area directly to a transit station north of Oregon City. To clarify this possibility, the following revision is proposed to the Highway 213 findings on page 3-55 of the draft 1999 RTP:

> "The I-205/Highway 213 interchange and Highway 213 south of Oregon City are expected to experience congestion during the evening two-hour peak despite capacity and intersection improvements from I-205 to Washington Street and Leland Road. Expanded transit service is not currently proposed for this corridor, but will be considered in the future in conjunction with rail transit or rapid bus service. New facilities parallel to Highway 213 would also be difficult to construct due to topographic and environmental constraints."

Further study of the suitability of the Beavercreek urban reserves are also recommended in section 3. 4.5 of the draft RTP. Transit service on Highway 213 could be studied as a part of that analysis and amendments made to the RTP, if appropriate.

Comment 83: The map for regional bus service is not consistent with the West Linn Transportation System Plan; future community bus route on Rosemont Road should run from the Rosemont/Salamo Road intersection, along Salamo Road to I-205 and the Willamette Main Street area. (City of West Linn, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 83: The community bus routes on the Regional Transit Service Strategy map in Chapter 5 are not intended to serve as adopted regional strategy. Rather, they are illustrative of the community bus routes that were modeled for transportation system performance analysis. These routes will be reviewed and adjusted annually as a part of Tri-Met's service planning process. As the Rosemont Road community bus route is implemented, Tri-Met will work with West Linn staff and the transportation system plan to define the specific bus routing.

In addition, amend the Regional Transit Service Strategy list to add the following footnote:

"Community Bus routes (shown in dark yellow) represent general coverage, not specific commitments to routing."

Comment 84: Section 4.4 should include a wider range of potential revenue sources, including mileage-based fees on automobiles and light trucks and a fee on pollution emitted. (Oregon Environmental Council, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 84: Section 4.4 is not intended to be a comprehensive list of potential new revenue sources but a summary of potential new revenue from existing or recently studied revenue sources. To clarify that there are other potential sources of transportation funding, amend the plan at the end of section 4.4.3 to include the following text,

> "Sources of revenue new to this region could also be considered to fund transportation needs. These include but are not limited to a parking tax, vehicle emission fees or vehicle miles traveled tax."

Comment 85: Remove project #3033 (125th Avenue Extension) from the RTP or move the project to be in a time frame after project #6021 which widens Scholls Ferry Road to seven lanes from Highway 217 to 125th Avenue. (Jim Persey, 12/13/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 85: No change is recommended. This project supports regional policies to increase local street connectivity throughout the region to improve bicycle and pedestrian access and to provide parallel routes of travel to accommodate local trips. In addition, this project has been on the city's transportation plan for many years. An extensive traffic analysis conducted by the City of Beaverton showed many benefits of the proposed extension. The proposed extension would significantly reduce traffic volumes on Sorrento Road, modestly reduce traffic volumes on Hart Road and Greenway Road and improve local accessibility in the immediate neighborhoods. The proposed extension also mitigates the need for capacity improvements at the intersection of Hall Boulevard and Greenway Road and provides a direct connection from Scholls Ferry Road to Hall Boulevard that links to school sites. This comment will be forwarded to the City of Beaverton for consideration.

Comment 86: LOS thresholds are often used to identify transportation improvements needed to accommodate new development. The developer is then often required to provide certain infrastructure to mitigate the development's impact on the transportation system. Oregon City understands the objectives of the Performance Measures (Table 1.1) but is concerned about the inherent reduced accountability of a new development to contribute to transportation impacts. (Oregon City, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 86: A local TSP can use higher performance standard than the RTP, provided that the higher standard doesn't result in "downstream" effects on the regional system, meets CMS requirements, accounts for latent traffic demand and complies with modal targets. An RTP amendment would be required to add resulting improvements to the regional plan. Section 6.4.7 of the RTP (Motor Vehicle Congestion Analysis), page 6-13, states the following: "By definition, the RTP addresses congestion of regional significance through the projects identified in Chapter 3 or refinement plans contained in this chapter of the plan. Other, more localized congestion is more appropriately addressed through the local TSP process, and includes any locations on the regional Motor Vehicle System (Figure 1.8) that are not addressed by the RTP. Intersection analysis and improvements generally fall outside of the RTP, and capacity improvements recommended in this plan generally apply to links in the regional system, not intersections."

Comment 87: Pages 3-55, 3-57 and 3-59 project a situation where Oregon City's part of the region is falling behind in mobility and transportation alternatives. There is a concern for freight mobility as well. Consider moving up the dates of the Oregon City projects for Washington Street (# 5135) and McLoughlin Boulevard (# 5137) from the years 2006-2010 to the years 2000-2005. (Oregon City, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 87: Moving these projects to years 2000-2005 in the Strategic System would not guarantee implementation, as there are already too many projects slated for 2000-2005 than the region can realistically afford. Projects 5135 and 5137 should be re-visited as the Financially Constrained RTP System is developed in the following months. These projects will be competing with other projects and programs in the Strategic System for placement on the Financially Constrained System.

TPAC will also be reviewing the timing of all projects included in the RTP prior to adoption by ordinance, to ensure that a reasonably balanced distribution of projects occurs over the full 20-year RTP planning period.

Comment 88: Include more transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in the Strategic System. A disproportionate number of these projects did not make the cut from the Preferred to the Strategic System. Without these options, it will become increasingly difficult to meet federal air quality standards as the region grows. Building better roads, which incorporate sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit options, gives a safe and convenient alternative to driving and encourages a sense of community. (Susan Garland, 12/2/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 88: Agree. A Financially Constrained System will be developed prior to adoption of the RTP by Ordinance in June 2000. Therefore, transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs described above will receive consideration as the Financially Constrained project list is developed.

Comment 89: The Green Streets outstanding issues on page 6-34 states that 20 percent of the urban landscape consists of right-of-way. This seems low, compared to other estimates that 40 percent of urban imperviousness can be attributed to the transportation system. (Audubon Society, 11/26/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 89: The 20 percent statistic refers to the amount of urban land that falls within the public right-of-way, and is not limited to that portion of the right-of-way that is covered with impervious surfaces. The 40 percent figure cited in this comment likely refers to the total transportation infrastructure, including parking lots. The Green Streets project will not include parking lots, since they are generally operated outside the right-of-way or public ownership.

Comment 90: Add project to the project list to construct a new on-ramp to southbound I-5 from Barbur Boulevard. (Don Baack, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 90: No change is recommended. Project #1205 (West Portland I-5 Access Study) is identified on the RTP project list and will study Taylors Ferry Road and Barbur Boulevard ramps to I-5. Amendments could be made to reflect the study recommendations as appropriate.

Comment 91: Amend description of project # 1195 (Barbur Boulevard Design Treatment) to start at Naito Parkway instead of Terwilliger Boulevard to reflect the Barbur Streetscape Plan adopted by the Portland City Council on December 8, 1999. (Don Baack, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 91: No change is recommended. Project #1195 is not intended to be inclusive of the Barbur Streetscape Plan adopted by the Portland City Council. In addition, the Barbur Streetscape Plan did not identify boulevard treatment along Barbur Boulevard from Naito Parkway to Terwilliger Boulevard. Instead, the plan identified a demonstration project for boulevard treatment along Barbur Boulevard from SW 19th Avenue to SW Alice Street.

Comment 92: Project 1200 (Pedestrian Overpass Near Markham School) should include a pedestrian overpass over Barbur Boulevard as well as I-5. In addition, add new project to construct a bicycle/pedestrian overpass over I-5 at Gibbs Street or Whitaker Street. (Don Baack, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 92: No change is recommended. Project #1206 (West Portland I-5 Crossings Study) is identified on the RTP project list and will study additional full street, pedestrian or bicycle overcrossings. Amendments could be made to reflect the study recommendations as appropriate.

Comment 93: Subregion reviews by citizens are needed as part of the RTP update process. (Don Baack, 12/15/99 *and Colleen Culbertson, 12/16/99*)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 93: The RTP update has been conducted in three stages over the past four years. The RTP update featured a greatly expanded public outreach effort. The update was guided by a 21-member Citizen Advisory Committee, made up of representatives from throughout the region, and included several public outreach efforts, special newsletters and a number of joint JPACT, MPAC and Council workshops held at key decision points. Public workshops were also held at several locations throughout the region in Spring 1996, November 1997, Fall 1998 and October 1999. The workshops emphasized engaging citizens in a subregional review of the draft RTP. The update also reflects the efforts of local officials, citizens and staff to develop transportation proposals that reflect the policy direction developed by the RTP CAC and regional growth management policies. Of the nearly 700 projects proposed through the year 2020 to address expected growth, and to implement the 2040 Growth Concept, more than half are new to the regional plan, and many were generated by citizen input.

Comment 94: Delete all references to an "expressway" on TV highway, including the system maps, and the corridor study bullets in Chapter 6. Remove Project 3121, TV Highway Refinement Planning. (Steve Larrance, 12/16/99 and Walt Hellman, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 94: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to comments 18 and 19, page 6 in this exhibit. Do not delete TV Highway corridor study language in Chapter 6, as the language is advisory only.

Comment 95: Delete the West Portland town center designation as a land use concept on which the RTP is attempting to serve. (Marti Sucek, 12-16-99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 95: The designation of the West Portland town center is a land use decision and an adopted component of the 2040 Growth Concept. The RTP is not a planning process for designating or changing regional land use designations. This comment will be forwarded to the Metro Growth Management department and the City of Portland planning bureau.

Comment 96: Growth should only be allowed when accompanied by a plan to provide infrastructure. (Larry Derr, 12-16-99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 96: The RTP and local transportation system plans provide a plan for transportation infrastructure improvements for growth. The plans do not require infrastructure to be implemented concurrently with the growth that occurs. State law and transportation administrative rules do not direct local transportation plans to require concurrency with growth. Local governments are allowed to adopt stricter regulations that require concurrency of infrastructure before development can be permitted. The Strategic System is a reasonable transportation system to address future growth as discussed previously in the JPACT recommended response to Comments 3 and 4.

Comment 97: A study of the feasibility and social and environmental impacts of the Tualatin-Sherwood connector is the only project that should be included in the RTP at this time. (Tom Aufenthie, 12-10-99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 97: Inclusion of a project in the RTP allows it to become eligible to apply for federal funding for analysis and construction. It is not a decision to build and construct the project. It is a policy statement that the region intends further study of the project as a means of meeting the transportation needs of the region. Before a highway project that receives federal funding may be constructed, it must complete federal requirements for an alternatives analysis and environmental impact study process. This process will compare project alternatives, which includes a No-build or do nothing alternative.

Comment 98: The RTP should include expanding transit service along the Highway 213 corridor. (John Williams, Mayor of Oregon City, 12-14-99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 98: See previous response to Comment 82.

Comment 99: Regional traffic must be separated from the local traffic in Raleigh Hills. Consider building an overpass system. (Mary Taylor, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 99: An overpass was considered as an alternative in a 1996 study, *Intersection of Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway with Oleson and Schools Ferry Roads.* The technical advisory committee and the citizen advisory committee rejected the overpass alternative.

Comment 100: The Fanno Creek system must be a factor in the decision-making when redesigning the intersection of Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway with Oleson and Schools Ferry Roads. (Mary Taylor, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 100: Agree. This is occurring in local project development. Fanno Creek supporters have been included in local advisory committees.

Comment 101: Project 1171 (SW 30th Avenue Bikeway) is very steep so putting bike lanes on it is futile and dangerous. Funding and project priorities for project 1169 (SW Vermont Bikeway) should emphasize, in priority order: stormwater handling and protection of Vermont Creek, maintenance or improvement of vehicle throughput during peak periods, sidewalks with curbs, bus shelters, preservation of existing parking opportunities and capacity, and bike lanes. The latter should not be done if it compromises achieving any higher listed priorities. These priorities should also apply to project 1217 (Multnomah Pedestrian District). (Don Bain, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 101: These projects are in the City Portland Bicycle Master Plan, adopted May 1, 1996 and updated July 1, 1998. Southwest Portland lacks bicycle system connectivity.

Comment 102: In project 1195 (Barbur Boulevard Design Treatment), curb extensions should not be used on Barbur Boulevard, or anywhere else, where they eliminate turning opportunities or lanes onto any road above local service street classification. (Don Bain, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 102: Curb extensions enhance pedestrian safety and connectivity by reducing pedestrian crossing distance and improving the visibility of pedestrians by motorists. Curb extensions are a design treatment found in ODOT, Metro and City of Portland street design guidelines.

Comment 103: New policies are needed in the RTP because too often bike lanes and transit stops seriously degrade transportation capacity or throughput for vehicles. The policies should state:

- Transit stops shall be placed in a manner that does not obstruct any forward-moving traffic lanes. Turnouts for transit will be added where needed to accomplish this.
- Bike lanes shall not be placed where they cause a loss of a vehicular lane or conflict with the ability to provide transit stops that do not obstruct traffic flow. (Don Bain, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 103: Do not add the above policies. Bullet one would be impractical to retrofit in built-out parts of the region, because the need for additional right-of-way would negatively impact existing housing and businesses. Bullet two would conflict with Policy 16.0 (Regional Bicycle System) c. Objective: Design the regional bikeway

system to function as part of an overall transportation system and include appropriate bicycle facilities in all transportation projects.

Comment 104: Currently it is impossible to clearly evaluate the progress that has been made toward implementation of the different elements. The RTP needs to establish benchmarks for measuring progress toward completion of the various components of the system. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 104: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Exhibit "B" to Resolution No. 99-2878, Part 2, Council Consent Items,* Comments 70, 71 and 72. This issue is addressed in revisions to Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3.

Comment 105: The process by which the RTP has been released to the public has made it difficult to have adequate public comment:

- The Adoption Draft was only made available on November 5th, long after the public hearings were complete. Prior drafts were incomplete with changes made; most public comment was focused on a moving target.
- The brochures describing the RTP reflect hundreds of projects that will never be built because of financial constraints.
- The comment period extends to December 16th; the actual decisions required for adoption of the plan have largely been made prior to the public comments begin (sic) complete. The result is that many of the comments provided here have not been adequately considered. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 105: A "Release Draft" RTP was available for public review in mid-October; making the draft available prior to the November 5th "Adoption Draft" provided an earlier opportunity for public input. The lengthy public comment period, October 4th through December 16th, met and exceeded Metro's adopted public involvement policy requirements. Refer also to the TPAC Recommendation on Comment 93 of this Attachment, for additional detail on RTP Update public involvement from 1995 through 1999.

Comment 106: In many locations the freight and commuter systems need to be separated so that facilities created to preserve the free movement of goods are not clogged by congestion created by people commuting to and from work. This will become especially critical as times when facilities are congested become longer – something that is inevitable as use of the automobile grows. Emphasis needs to be placed on assuring access to rail and port facilities as the primary modes for moving freight. High priority needs to be placed on providing rail service for freight movement. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 106: Agree that freight service needs to be preserved. Separating freight and commuter systems is an option, but is not always practical.

Comment 107: Additional emphasis should be placed on expanding use of existing railroad track for passenger service both for urban commuters and as a transportation option for people who live outside the region. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 107: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to *Resolution No. 99-2878B, Exhibit B,* JPACT Recommendation on Comment 120, on page 29.

Comment 108: Traffic and congestion management tools should be used to maintain existing capacity for its most efficient use in meeting the region 2040 concept. Traffic demand management, freight only lanes and bridges and high occupancy vehicle lanes should all be considered prior to adding new capacity. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 108: This requirement is already stated in Chapter 6. Refer also to Comment 29 on page 7of *Exhibit B to Resolution No. 99-2878.*

Comment 109: Metro needs to adopt a structure for corridor management that combines land-use, urban design and transportation. Currently the fragmented planning process does not allow consideration of the kind of integrated design that will meet 2040. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 109: Corridor management has evolved since adoption of the Metro 2040 Regional Framework Plan. Metro will continue working with ODOT, local governments and the public to meet community objectives during corridor planning studies.

Comment 110: Metro needs to create a regional transportation budget that considers all transportation expenditures by local, regional and state agencies. It is especially critical in light of the limited resources available for transportation improvements that there be a clear picture of how all resources are currently applied. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 110: Agree. Chapter 4 (Financial Analysis) explains this approach.

Comment 111: Local jurisdictions should not be asked to bring their local TSPs into conformance with a regional transportation plan that is unrealistic in its estimates of revenue (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 111: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to JPACT Comments 1 through 4 in *Exhibit B to Resolution No. 99-2878.*

Comment 112: We don't believe the current plan meets the requirements of the state transportation planning rule. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 112: Findings will be developed prior to RTP adoption by Ordinance. If additions to the findings are necessary, they will be made.

Comment 113: The plan should include modeling for a system in which there are no new investments in commuter road capacity. All current models anticipate some investment designed for automobile commuters. (CLF, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 113: This comment has been previously addressed. Refer to Resolution No. 99-2878B, Exhibit B, JPACT Recommendation on Comment 86, on page 20.

Comment 114: Considering that all bike and pedestrian projects combined make up only around 5% of the entire RTP "preferred" budget, the BAC asks Metro to balance this relatively minor investment against the potential good these projects can do for our region. Metro should fully fund every bike project on the RTP list, then cut from the remaining 95% of the "preferred" list to create the "constrained" budget project list. (City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 114: Completing the regional bicycle system is included in Policy 16.0 of Chapter 1. Bicycle system improvements on regional access bikeways and regional corridor projects are given priority in the MTIP process. Transportation projects are funded through the MTIP process at three-year intervals. Metro will develop a Financially Constrained System prior to adoption of the RTP by Ordinance in July 2000, and bicycle and pedestrian projects will receive consideration as the Financially Constrained list is developed.

Comment 115: The Morrison Bridge bikeway retrofit should be funded for completion by 2002 rather than the 2006-2010 time slot. (City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee, 12/15/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 115: Agree that the Morrison Bridge bicycle access project (RTP # 1062) be moved to 2000-2005. However, funding for completion of the project by 2002 is unlikely, because it is included in the 2000 to 2003 MTIP for preliminary engineering but not construction.

Comment 116: The RTP public comment period should be extend to end February 1, 2000. The Milwaukie Traffic Safety Board wants to review and comment on the RTP at their January 2000 meeting (Julie Wisner, 12/16/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 116: Metro Council's action after the December 16, 1999 public hearing was to adopt the RTP by Resolution. The RTP will go before the Metro Council for adoption by Ordinance in July 2000, so there will be additional opportunities for public comment.

Comment 117: Add a new objective to Policy 19.0 (Transportation Demand Management) to recognize that other market-based pricing strategies should be investigated in addition to strategies identified in Policy 19.1 (Parking Management) and 19.2 (Peak Period Pricing).

> "h. Objective: Investigate the use of policies that accurately reflect the full costs of transportation to encourage more efficient use of resources."

(Oregon Environmental Council, 12/10/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 117: Amend page 1-55 to add the following language, "h. Objective: Investigate the use of market-based strategies that reflect the full costs of transportation to encourage more efficient use of resources."

Comment 118: The RTP should direct Tri-Met, SMART and C-Tran to develop programs that reach out and build ridership among youth, elderly and disabled populations. (Multnomah County, 12/8/99)

TPAC Recommendation on Comment 118: Agree, amend as follows:

1.3.3 Equal Access and Safety; Policy 5.0 Barrier-Free Transportation

- Objective: Develop outreach programs that encourage and support ridership among youth, elderly and disabled population

TK:rmb

c\resolutions\2000\00-2888\Exhibit A to Res 00-2888A.doc

METRO

1999 Regional Transportation Plan

Amendment to Exhibit "A" to Resolution No. 00-2888

[Note: This staff recommendation is in response to the attached written comments that was submitted to the Council on December 16, 1999, but not included in Exhibit "A"]

Comment 119: Revise Section 6.2.3 of the November 5 draft of the RTP as follows:

"The RTP addresses this OHP designation through the boulevard design classifications, which correspond to the 2040 central city, regional center, town center and main street land use components. In the Metro region, various segments of state highways within these land use components are generally eligible to be designated STAs, as defined in the OHP. Also, various highway segment s within regional centers and town centers could be eligible to be designated UBAs. Further, the application of the boulevard design classifications also factor in major freight corridors, and this design classification is generally not applied to such routes...."

(Mark Whitlow, Retail Task Force, 12/16/99)

Staff Recommendation on Comment 119: This comment proposes a change to clarify how the RTP design classifications would relate to the Special District designations in the Oregon Highway plan. However, the changes proposed do not adequately describe the relationship between the RTP designations and the OHP. Instead, staff recommends that the following clarifying language be included in the RTP:

6.2.3 Special Designations in the Oregon Highway Plan

(Note: The following language was adopted by Resolution No. 99-2878B; proposed amendments are shown in underscore below.)

The Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) establishes three special district designations for certain areas along state-owned facilities. The purpose of the designations is to respond to unique community access and circulation needs, while maintaining statewide travel function. Though these special districts are generally identified jointly between ODOT and local jurisdictions, the RTP establishes a policy framework that supports these OHP designations through the 2040 Growth Concept and corresponding regional street design classifications contained in Section 1.3.5. The following is a summary of how RTP street design designations correspond to the OHP special district classifications:

Special Transportation Area (STA): this designation is intended to provide access to community activities, businesses and residences along state facilities in a downtown, business district or community center. In these areas, the OHP acknowledges that local access issues outweigh

highway mobility, except on certain freight routes, where mobility needs are more balanced with local access.

The RTP addresses this OHP designation through the boulevard design classifications, ~~which correspond to~~ located in the 2040 central city, regional center, town center and main street land use components. In the Metro region, ~~these land use components are~~ state routes designated as boulevards are eligible to be designated STAs, as defined in the OHP. Further, the application of the boulevard design classifications also factors in major freight corridors, and this design classification is generally not applied to such routes.

Commercial Center: this designation applies to relatively large (400,000 square feet) commercial centers located along state facilities. In these areas, the OHP allows for consolidate access roads or driveways that serve these areas, but such access is subject to meeting OHP mobility standards on the state highway serving the center.

The RTP supports this OHP designation with the throughway design classifications, which include freeway and highway design types. The throughway designs are mobility-oriented, and generally apply to routes that form major motor vehicle connections between the central city, regional centers and intermodal facilities. The throughway design classifications support the concept of limiting future access on a number of state facilities in the region that are designated as principal routes in the RTP.

Urban Business Area (UBA): this designation recognizes existing commercial strips or centers along state facilities with the objective of balancing access need with the need to move through-traffic.

In the Metro region, these areas are generally designated as mixed-use corridors and neighborhoods in the 2040 Growth Concept, and a corresponding regional or community street design classification in the RTP which calls for a balance between motor vehicle mobility, and local access. These designs are multi-modal in nature, and include transit, bicycle and pedestrian design features, consistent with the OHP designation. The regional and community street classification can also be found in some regional an town centers, and where these are state routes, the facility is eligible for the OHP designation of Urban Business Area.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 00-2888A APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Date: January 6, 2000 . Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would supplement revisions to the 1999 RTP approved by JPACT and the Council in December 1999. The purpose of the supplemental resolution is to respond to public comments received during the final stage of the RTP public comment period, after JPACT had forwarded a final recommendation to the Council. These supplemental revisions are summarized in Exhibit A to Resolution 00-2888A. Exhibit A is organized as follows:

- Proposed Discussion Items - This section of the exhibit includes major issues that merit Council discussion, due to their scope or complexity. For each comment included in this section, JPACT has recommended a specific action to Council.

- Proposed Consent Items - This section includes minor issues that do not necessarily merit Council discussion, and JPACT recommends that the revisions proposed in this section be approved as a single package.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN	)))))	RESOLUTION NO. 00-2888 Introduced by Jon Kvistad, JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, the November 5 draft of the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was approved by Council resolution on December 16, 1999; and

WHEREAS, the Council action included amendments to the draft, as recommended by JPACT and MPAC; and

WHEREAS, the Council resolution forwards additional comments received on the 1999 RTP during the public comment period to JPACT for review and supplemental recommendations; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED,

That the supplemental amendments contained in Exhibit A be incorporated with amendments to the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan approved by Council resolution on December 16, 1999.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 2000.

_____
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

APPROVED AS TO FORM

_____
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

C\Resolutions\2000\00-2888

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 00-2888, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: January 20, 2000 Presented by: Councilor Kvistad

Committee Recommendation: At its September 22, meeting, the Committee considered Resolution No. 00-2888 and voted unanimously to send the resolution to the Council with a do pass recommendation. Voting in favor: Councilors Bragdon (sitting in for Councilor McLain) and Kvistad and Chair Monroe.

Existing Law: Federal law requires Metro, as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area, to periodically prepare a transportation plan for the region. The plan must be updated every 3-5 years. Prior to completion of the 1999 plan update process, Metro is operating with an interim plan. This interim plan received federal approval with the understanding that it would be revised when Metro had completed certain growth management planning processes, such as 2040, the functional plan and urban reserve designations. Development of a transportation plan is also required under state law.

Committee Issues/Discussion: Andy Cotugno, Transportation Planning Director, presented the staff report. He noted that when the Council adopted the 1999 update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in December, certain comments and proposed amendments to the draft update had not yet been acted on by JPACT. The Transportation Planning Committee and the Council determined that, instead of including this comments and amendments in the update subject to JPACT approval that a separate resolution should be presented following formal action by JPACT. The proposed resolution reflects JPACT action taken at its January meeting on the comments and proposed amendments.

Cotugno explained that the comments were divided into two classifications, approval by consent and approval by discussion. The committee accepted the consent items and asked Mr. Cotugno to review the three "approval by discussion" items. The first issue concerned a request that the RTP include a commitment that jointly staff a task force to recommend ways to "broaden and expand" special needs transportation services. Cotugno indicated that staff is recommending that a minor edit in the proposed plan be made and that Tri-Met, TPAC, JPACT, and various local aging agencies work to develop possible additional recommendations for inclusion in the final adoption ordinance for the 1999 Plan Update.

The second issue was raised by several that commented on the proposed plan. They expressed concern that the potential cost of the strategic system option outlined was so much greater than projected revenues that the option would only serve to raise expectations with no real hope of ever building the proposed system. Cotugno recommended no changes in the plan at this time. He noted that, during the next six months, staff would be developing a "financially constrained" option that more clearly reflects potentially available funding resources. When that work is completed the original strategic system may be scaled down.

The third issue relates to a request to drop "level of service" (LOS) as a measurement tool. Cotugno noted that there are a variety of measurement tools used in the plan and recommended that the LOS approach not be dropped.

The committee adopted the staff recommendation for each of the "approval by discussion" issues.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 00-2888 APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO THE 1999 UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

Date: January 6, 2000 Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would supplement revisions to the 1999 RTP approved by JPACT and the Council in December 1999. The purpose of the supplemental resolution is to respond to public comments received during the final stage of the RTP public comment period, after JPACT had forwarded a final recommendation to the Council. These supplemental revisions are summarized in Exhibit A to Resolution 00-2888. Exhibit A is organized as follows:

- Proposed Discussion Items - This section of the exhibit includes major issues that merit Council discussion, due to their scope or complexity. For each comment included in this section, JPACT has recommended a specific action to Council.

- Proposed Consent Items - This section includes minor issues that do not necessarily merit Council discussion, and JPACT recommends that the revisions proposed in this section be approved as a single package.