



METRO

TEL 503-797-1916 FAX 503-797-1930

MEETING: TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE

DATE: February 23, 2007

TIME: 9:30 A.M.

PLACE: Council Chamber, 370A/B

- | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--|-------------------------|
| 9:30 AM | 1. | Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum | Andy Cotugno |
| 9:30 AM | 2. | Citizen communications to TPAC on non-agenda items | Andy Cotugno |
| 9:35 AM | 3. * | Approval of TPAC minutes for January 26, 2007 and February 2, 2007 | Andy Cotugno |
| 9:45 AM | 4. | Future Agenda Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willamette River Bridges (anytime) • Regional Rail System • Regional Freight Data Collection Project Findings (March) | Andy Cotugno |
| | 5. | <u>ACTION ITEMS</u> | |
| 9:50 AM | 5.1 ** | Resolution No. 07-3755, For the Purpose of Endorsing the Policy Direction, Plan Goals and Objectives to Guide Development of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)– <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u> | Kim Ellis & Tom Kloster |
| 11:30 AM | 5.2 * | Resolution No. 07-3786, For the Purpose of Consideration of the Regional Travel Options Program Work Plan and Funding Suballocations for Fiscal Year 07-08 – <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u> | Pam Peck |
| | 6. | <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS</u> | |
| 11:35 AM | 6.1 * | Regional Transportation Options Grants Program Update – <u>INFORMATION</u> | Pam Peck |
| 11:50 AM | 6.2 # | ITS Study Group Progress Report – <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION</u> | Ron Weinman |
| 12:00 PM | 7. | ADJOURN | Andy Cotugno |

* Material available electronically.

Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy

** Material to be emailed at a later date.

Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available at the meeting.



METRO

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATES COMMITTEE

January 26, 2007

Metro Regional Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott Bricker	Citizen
Jack Burkman	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Greg DiLoreto	Citizen
Sorin Garber	Citizen
Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin, representing Cities of Washington County
Dave Nordberg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
John Reinhold	Citizen
Sreya Sarkar	Citizen
Phil Selinger	TriMet
Paul Smith	City of Portland
Rian Windsheimer	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region 1)
Ron Weinman	Clackamas County

AFFILIATION

MEMBERS ABSENT

Frank Angelo	Citizen
Brent Curtis	Washington County
John Hoefs	C-Tran
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Jonathan Young	FHWA

AFFILIATION

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ed Abrahamson	Multnomah County
Andy Back	Washington County
Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville
Jonathan David	City of Gresham
Linda David	SW Washington RTC
Michelle Eraut	FHWA
Robin McCaffrey	Port of Portland
Margaret Middleton	City of Beaverton
Ed Pickering	C-Tran
Lainie Smith	ODOT

AFFILIATION

GUESTS PRESENT

Kenny Asher
MJ Coe
Lawrence Odell
Patty McMillan
Greg Raisman
Mark Lear
Derek Robbins
Terry Whisler

AFFILIATION

City of Milwaukie
Sullivan's Gulch Corridor Trail Committee
Washington County LUT
Clackamas County – Safe Communities
PDOT
PDOT
Forest Grove
City of Cornelius

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Richard Brandman, Ted Leybold, Josh Naramore, Amy Rose, Jessica Martin

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM & INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Richard Brandman called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 9:33a.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3. MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2007 MEETING

ACTION TAKEN: Mr. Phil Selinger moved, seconded by Mr. Dave Nordberg to approve the January 5, 2007 meeting minutes. The motion passed.

4. INPUT ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Brandman reviewed the future agenda items and added that he would present a Streetcar presentation at the March meeting.

5. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Regional Safety Planning

Mr. Mark Lear and Mr. Greg Raisman, both with the City of Portland, appeared before the committee to present information on Regional Safety Planning. Their PowerPoint presentation (included as part of this meeting record) included information on:

- The community and school traffic safety partnership
- Work that still needs to be done
 - Traffic fatalities
 - Safety concerns
- Good trends
 - Declining bicycle crash rates/increased ridership
 - Declining pedestrian crash rates/increased transit ridership
 - Declining child pedestrian and bicycle crash rates
 - Declining auto crash injury rates
- Opportunities and responsibilities
 - Community and school traffic safety partnership
 - Increased Federal funding
 - PSU National Transportation Research

- Pedestrian refuge islands
- Bike safety projects
- Subsidized residential purchase projects
- Strong state traffic safety program
- Safe routes to school
- Collaboration from community partners
- Recommendations for Metro
 - Form a regional traffic safety committee
 - Partner with ODOT/Portland on 82nd Avenue of Roses Operational Safety Strategy
 - Create a regional Safe Routes to School strategy
 - Increase funding to meet minimum standard for safe crossings for transit
 - Prioritize regional bike network that includes bike boulevards

Mr. Paul Smith noted that the City of Portland would soon hire a consultant to look at the 20 highest crash locations.

Ms. Danielle Cowan commented that an issue in SW Portland is the fact that there are few sidewalks and bicyclists don't like to ride on the roads because of the close proximity to cars. Mr. Lear responded that while sidewalks are important, facilities with higher speeds and volume have more crash incidents.

5.2 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Andy Cotugno provided the committee with a first draft of the UPWP. The federal review will take place on February 26th from 9a.m.-noon at Metro. He asked that any additions and updates be provided to him as soon as possible. TPAC is expected to take action on the UPWP at their March 30th meeting after the federal review.

5.3 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan Final Cut List Briefing

Mr. Ted Leybold appeared before the committee and provided a briefing on the MTIP Final Cut List. He directed the committee's attention to several handouts (included as part of the meeting record) which included a memo, the MTIP staff recommended program narrowing factors rationale, the base program narrowing factors rationale, a calendar of activities, a draft resolution and the draft staff recommended final cut project list. He reminded the committee of the special TPAC meeting on Friday, February 2nd, immediately following the RTP workshop, where TPAC would be asked to take action on a final cut list. Mr. Cotugno noted that there would be a joint Metro Council/JPACT public hearing on February 13th.

Mr. Andy Back inquired about the difference between the base program and staff recommendation. Mr. Cotugno clarified that the base program represents the minimum. Projects recommended above the base program incorporate choices and value judgments (taking into consideration the evaluation criteria). He noted that the Metro staff recommendation is a first attempt at making and or identifying some of these choices (as shown by the gray and dotted boxes in the final cut project list handout).

Mr. Leybold noted that the purpose of this briefing was to have the committee comfortable with the base program so that at their special meeting on February 2nd, the committee could focus their debate mainly on the field of projects above the base program recommendation.

Mr. Leybold summarized the projects in each of the categories and noted which projects were included in the staff recommended and why.

Mr. Scott Bricker inquired about the public participation process and whether or not public comments were considered as part of the evaluation criteria. Mr. Leybold responded that yes, public comments were considered and included as the environmental justice criteria. Mr. Smith asked which project received the most negative comments, to which, Mr. Leybold responded: Boones Ferry. Mr. Bricker suggested it would be helpful to have an explanation, particularly to the public, why projects they have either supported or opposed, did or did not make the final cut list.

Mr. John Reinhold inquired about the individual project scores. Mr. Leybold responded that those could be found in the project description book, which staff would be happy to provide to anyone wishing to receive a copy.

6. ADJOURN

As there was no further business, Mr. Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 11:37a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Martin, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR JANUARY 26, 2007

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
* 3.	Minutes	1/5/07	TPAC Meeting Minutes of January 5, 2007	012607t-01
* 5.2	Report	1/19/07	Draft FY2007-08 Unified Planning Work Program	012607t-02
** 5.1	PowerPoint	1/26/07	Transportation Safety Portland presentation by Greg Raisman and Mark Lear (City of Portland)	012607t-03
** 5.1	Information Sheet	12/18/07	Portland Traffic Safety Coordination Council	012607t-04
** 5.1	Information	N/A	City of Portland Traffic Safety Update	012607t-05
** 5.3	Calendar	1/26/07	2007 Calendar of activities for 2008-11 MTIP	012607t-06
** 5.3	Memo	1/25/07	To: TPAC From: Ted Leybold Re: Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Metro Staff Recommended Final Cut List	012607t-07
** 5.3	Information	1/26/07	Base Program Rationale	012607t-08
** 5.3	Information	N/A	MTIP Staff Recommended Program Rationale	012607t-09
** 5.3	Resolution	N/A	Resolution 07-3773, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOCATING \$64 MILLION OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FUNDING FOR THE YEARS 2010 AND 2011 PENDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION	012607t-10
** 5.3	List	N/A	Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut Project List	012607t-11

* Included in packet

**Distributed at meeting



METRO

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATES COMMITTEE

February 2, 2007

Metro Regional Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott Bricker
Greg DiLoreto
Sorin Garber
Nancy Kraushaar
Mike McKillip
Dave Nordberg
Ron Papsdorf
John Reinhold
Sreya Sarkar
Phil Selinger
Paul Smith
Rian Windsheimer
Ron Weinman

AFFILIATION

Citizen
Citizen
Citizen
City of Oregon City/Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin/Cities of Washington County
DEQ
City of Gresham
Citizen
Citizen
TriMet
City of Portland
ODOT
Clackamas County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Susie Lahsene
Karen Schilling

AFFILIATION

Port of Portland
Multnomah County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ed Abrahamson
Andy Back
John Gillam
Robin McCaffrey

AFFILIATION

Multnomah County
Washington County
City of Portland
Port of Portland

GUESTS PRESENT

Bill Barber
Danielle Cowan
Byron Estes
Joan Kwok
Jean Luke
R. Scott Pemble
Lawrence O'Dell
Derek Robbins
Jonathan Schlueter

AFFILIATION

Citizen
Wilsonville
PDC
Meriwether
Meriwether
Multnomah County
Washington County
Forest Grove
Westside Economic Alliance

STAFF

Andy Cotugno, Paulette Copperstone Kim Ellis, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, John Mermin, Josh Naramore, Amy Rose, Caleb Winter

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Cotugno called the special meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. and noted a quorum was present.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

3 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Transportation Priorities Final Cut List

Ted Leybold, MTIP Manager, distributed his February 2, 2007 memo to TPAC “Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Metro Staff Recommended Final Cut List (green) and the revised Transportation Priorities 2008-11 Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List (white) and explained changes/corrections further. He said based on comments received at the last TPAC, staff added more information about public support and staff comments.

Chair Cotugno said the recommendations were divided into Base Program and MTIP Staff Recommended Program(s) and that staff thought TPAC should take action on the Base Program first. He asked for a motion on the Base Program and also for a 2nd tier start with the base recommendation. The Committee discussed how to proceed. Paul Smith said Ted Leybold and staff did a great job, that the memo and staff report weighed policy and geographic equity together and it would be more rational to move staff’s recommendation as the main motion.

Main Motion (#1):	Paul Smith moved, seconded by Ron Papsdorf, to approve the MTIP Staff Recommended Program.
--------------------------	--

Ron Papsdorf said JPACT instructed TPAC to support projects for urban reserve areas brought into the UGB that have completed their planning work and said one of those areas was Pleasant Valley.

1st Motion to Amend Main Motion (#2):	Ron Papsdorf moved, seconded by Paul Smith, to amend SE 190 th Drive: Pleasant View/Highland to SW 30 th Street to increase the passing corridor and bike lanes for a total of \$883,000; \$600,000 from MTIP matched by \$223,194.00 from Pleasant Valley. The reduction in MTIP would come from \$350,000 from the RTO Program and \$250,000 reduction in funding for the ITS program.
---	--

Ron Papsdorf clarified that part of his rationale for the motion was that the RTO program has received additional funds in previous cycles and that the ITS program is new and has not been fully developed thus making a cut in funding reasonable. He said the ITS program can receive additional funding in subsequent MTIP cycles. Ron Papsdorf said Pleasant Valley could provide \$220,000 of the estimated costs now. He said SDCs couldn’t be collected until development is in place. He said the area should have real added value, not suburban sprawl, and that good investments should be made in the area at the beginning. He noted the project would be in an

existing part of the city not inside the UGB to begin with but that was added, and leads to, Pleasant Valley. Chair Cotugno asked Ron Papsdorf to recommend a friendly amendment to the motion that the cut in the RTO budget come first from the \$300,000 Individualized Marketing program since that was nominated by the RTO program as supplemental to the RTO program. Ron Papsdorf noted RTO had received a 14 percent increase in their budget. Chair Cotugno suggested that TPAC not micro-manage, and let RTO decide where the funds should come from. Ron Papsdorf agreed.

Scott Bricker said Pleasant Valley/Gresham have the highest SDCs in the region and asked if those were an option. Chair Cotugno said MTIP could set that up as criteria. He said when they finally get to financing the RTP, those issues will be on the table and the wide disparity in SDCs around the region will be on the table for discussion also.

The Committee discussed the motion to amend further. John Reinhold asked what the recommended cuts were for ITS again. Ron Papsdorf said ITS is a brand new program so it should have two years to get started and then they could come back and revisit their appropriate level of funding. Greg DiLoreto asked how the 190th project compared with the others. Staff said it ranked 75.5.

Andy Back said he agreed with Paul Smith’s recommendation, but expressed concern about amending staff’s recommendation. He said the Committee should start with the base program recommendations first. Chair Cotugno asked the Committee if they wished to proceed the way they started or if they wanted to start by amending the base program first. Ron Papsdorf said Metro staff selected the “gray boxes” and that it would be fair to discuss the whole thing and then make amendments.

Andy Back said it was up to Paul Smith to amend the Main Motion. Chair Cotugno said if so, the motion would be to substitute the base program for the motion on the floor.

<i>Motion to Substitute and Replace Main Motion (#3):</i>	Andy Back moved, seconded by Paul Smith, that TPAC approve the Base Program instead of the MTIP Staff Recommended Program.
--	--

<i>Vote on #3</i>	Two members voted aye. The rest voted nay. The motion failed to pass.
--------------------------	---

Scott Bricker asked what lists staff were sending to JPACT. He said the list should be called the “TPAC list,” not the base list or the staff recommended list. Rian Windsheimer said TPAC could support that. Phil Selinger said the list should be presented as intact to JPACT as possible. He said the logic, scoring, and other components should all be considered. A committee member asked how TPAC had done this in the past. Ted Leybold said staff had presented the TPAC list with a summary of the changes.

<i>2nd Motion to Amend Main Motion: (#4)</i>	Mike McKillip, seconded by Andy Back, to add \$2 million for Farmington Road.
--	---

Margaret Middleton said the project met all significant criteria, had gaps in the sidewalks so would qualify as a gap-filling project and would be a highly regionally significant project on a former state highway.

Chair Cotugno said TPAC was over programming already. He said as it stands now, 10% of the projects will need to slip into a subsequent year. Andy Back asked if engineering was included in the Farmington Road project. Chair Cotugno said the project has been around since the first UGB decision was made in the 1970s and that the engineering has been done which was a good first step. John Reinhard asked if the ROW acquisition was meant to increase lane capacity. Margaret Middleton said it was. The Committee discussed project details further.

3rd Motion to Amend Main Motion: (#5)	Nancy Kraushaar moved, seconded by Ron Weinman, to add McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River to Dunes Drive back to the list asking for it to be funded from a non-specific source.
---	--

Nancy Kraushaar explained the project represented \$120 million in private sector investment and tied into water quality and tourist benefits. She said the development of Clackamette Cove would clean up a blighted urban area, add to the tax rolls and enhance their comprehensive plan. She said she was not comfortable with suggesting that funds be taken from other sources to fund it at this time but wanted to move the project forward for discussion. She said that the regional balance might be a little skewed. Ron Papsdorf asked if the developer was contributing funds or the ROW. Nancy Kraushaar said the development did not front McLoughlin but they were not asking the City for development funds.

Chair Cotugno said they did this every two years and assumed there would be slippage, then the over programming goes away. He said every year they start with an analysis of how much funding they have and explained financing methodologies further.

Scott Bricker asked what happened to the Willamette Greenway Trail project. He said the City of Portland submitted information on a \$600,000 phase of the project. He said if TPAC was going to approve other projects than that project should at least get a gray box. He asked what happened to the project if it would have warranted a gray box.

Ted Leybold said the City of Portland did submit an updated application and that information was provided to TPAC at their January 26 meeting and additional copies were available at this meeting also. He said the information staff got was the same they got for the 190th project and said they were not going to do a big technical evaluation because they would end up in an endless loop. He said staff did not recommend a change to the first cut projects recommended by TPAC. He said if it moved forward, it would be up to TPAC. Scott Bricker requested that JPACT get a memo detailing the changes to these lists.

Gregg Everhart in the audience reminded those present that it was initially scored but never showed up very high on the list. She said it was very high on citizen lists and it would be awkward if not included.

4th Motion to Amend Main Motion (#6)	Scott Bricker moved, seconded by Paul Smith, make the Willamette Greenway project a gray box on the list with \$ 1.2 million and \$.6 million
--	---

Chair Cotugno said the Willamette Greenway Trail could be listed at \$1.2 million for the first segment and a second segment at \$.6 million. Scott Bricker said \$1.2 million would be funded through the City of Portland. John Reinhold asked if this was just a case of bringing forth a history of what has happened up to now. He said the final recommendation reflect that the

numbers have changed. Ted Leybold said he was reticent about portraying it that way in the Base Program because then it would open the door for everyone who was not on the 1st cut list. Robin McCaffrey asked if there was discussion about awarding it or if staff asked that the funds get moved. Scott Bricker said it was recommended it be funded. He said he made the motion that the trail should not come out of this list again because he did not think it was the best use of the region's money. But he said it was an extension piece and at the time they were not able to come to agreement with the Portland Parks Department. He said what is different now is that a lot of different partners have come to the table.

Greg DiLoreto said TPAC has the list for JPACT and now there were four projects TPAC wants JPACT to "know" about. He said all JPACT has to know is that TPAC had a huge discussion and that all of the projects are important. Paul Smith noted the project did score high. John Reinhold asked if the project would take care of a gap. Scott Bricker said it would and described the project further.

Sorin Garber said a compromise could be a minority report of sorts so that JPACT could just get the list. Scott Bricker said he was not recommending the project differently than reflected in the materials. Phil Selinger said he liked the original staff recommendation and thought it should be presented unamended.

Chair Cotugno said that went back to Greg DiLoreto's suggestion to vote nay on the amendments, present the staff report to JPACT but highlight these items as presented. He said if they voted aye on the amendments TPAC would want to tell JPACT that was \$4.8 million of over programming. Andy Back asked if allocation by 10 percent was high or low and asked for some historical background on the issues. Chair Cotugno explained over programming further. Andy Back asked if it would be possible to combine the four projects together in one motion.

John Reinhold asked if TPAC was approving the numbers or staff's (green) memo? Ted Leybold said TPAC was approving Resolution No. 07-3773, For the Purpose of Allocating \$64 Million of Transportation Priorities Funding for the Years 2010 and 2011, Pending Air Quality Conformity Determination (pink) plus the numbers list.

<i>Vote on Motion #6</i>	All those present voted aye on \$.6 million for the Willamette Greenway. There were no abstentions.
---------------------------------	---

Chair Cotugno said TPAC should vote on over programming. Greg DiLoreto said he would vote nay on over programming. Ron Papsdorf said they should ask JPACT if they wanted to over program or not and tell them about the projects. He said he could not recall over programming by a by a full 10 percent before. He said the Cornelius project was relatively small. Nancy Kraushaar said TPAC could tell JPACT it was about regional balance and noted JPACT would trade projects also. Ted Leybold discussed projects that fulfilled regional balance goals. Ron Papsdorf said the McLoughlin project was very important to Clackamas County.

Mike McKillip said if projects popped in, after all the background work had been done, they should not be able to get on the list. Andy Back was uncomfortable with taking something off the list but thought some unlisted projects were as good as what was on the list. He said it was for JPACT to make policy decisions on over programming. John Reinhold said there was a big difference between the two projects. He said Washington County and Beaverton have funds they are willing to contribute if the projects go through, whereas the McLoughlin Boulevard project doesn't. He asked what would happen to Beaverton's funds if this did not get approved.

Margaret Middleton said they would continue to pursue the funding whatever the source. She said the project would pop up again in two years.

Phil Selinger said it would not be a good use of funds to split the two and that it was TPAC's job to deliver a balanced list to JPACT. Rian Windsheimer said that was why they were providing them with the second list. He said TPAC would talk to them about today's meeting anyway. Nancy Kraushaar said TPAC could present them with priorities. Ron Papsdorf said Mike McKillip's motion was different from Nancy Kraushaar's motion – it was to over program by \$2 million. Mike McKillip said that was not quite right - they just wanted to suck up the first \$2 million that did not get used. Dave Nordberg wanted JPACT to know that if TPAC did not discuss a project that did not mean it did not have their support. Danielle Cowan said JPACT would discuss what they wanted to discuss anyway but would note the areas TPAC struggled with.

Paul Smith said Greg DiLoreto made a good point that there will be a meeting record and memos resulting from the meeting JPACT would know what the discussion was about at TPAC.

<i>Motion #7</i>	Paul Smith moved, seconded by Robin McCaffrey, to send a memo to JPACT detailing TPAC's discussion at this meeting.
-------------------------	---

Chair Cotugno suggested action on the Farmington motion, giving it \$2 million contingent on the other \$2 million and doing the same for the McLoughlin project at \$2.8 million. The Committee discussed over programming further. Ted Leybold said TPAC should just approve a simple over program and not prioritize. Mike McKillip and Andy Back, the mover and seconder of Motion No. 4, agreed to the modification.

<i>Vote on Motion #4</i>	Four members aye. Eleven members voted nay. The vote was 11/4 against and the motion failed.
---------------------------------	--

Chair Cotugno said TPAC should give further consideration to McLoughlin either by cutting or over programming.

<i>Vote on Motion #5</i>	Five members voted yes. Ten members voted nay. The vote was 10/5 against and the motion failed.
---------------------------------	---

Chair Cotugno said now TPAC should vote on the motion about Farmington and McLoughlin. Scott Bricker made a friendly amendment to add \$600,000 to that list. Robin McCaffrey said TPAC did not have that discussion and thought the meeting record reflecting that was enough. Paul Smith said it was simply to reflect the level of discussion from the project proponents. Scott Bricker concurred and said if all four projects went down, all four should go in the memo. Robin McCaffrey said it was a moot point and that JPACT was going to do what it wanted. Chair Cotugno said the memo should provide information to JPACT about the three projects that were discussed at some length: McLoughlin, Farmington and the \$600,000 trail segment.

<i>Vote on Motion #7</i>	Two members voted nay. The rest of the committee voted aye. The motion passed.
---------------------------------	--

<i>Vote on Main Motion as Amended (Motion #1)</i>	All those present voted aye. The main motion as amended passed unanimously.
--	---

The Committee briefly discussed what information they should provide JPACT about this meeting.

4. ADJOURN

As there was no further business, Mr. Cotugno adjourned the meeting at 4:45p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Paulette Copperstone, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR FEBRUARY 2, 2007

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	TOPIC	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
* 3.1	Calendar	1/26/07	Calendar of Activities for 2007 Transportation Priorities and 2008-11 MTIP	020207t-01
* 3.1	Memo	1/25/07	To: TPAC From: Ted Leybold Re: Transportation Priorities 2008-11 – Draft Metro Staff Recommended Final Cut List	020207t-02
* 3.1	Information	1/26/07	Base Program Narrowing Factors rationale	020207t-03
* 3.1	Information	N/A	MTIP Staff Recommended Program Narrowing Factors rationale	020207t-04
* 3.1	Resolution	N/A	Resolution No. 07-3773, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOCATING \$64 MILLION OF TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES FUNDING FOR THE YEARS 2010 AND 2011, PENDING AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION	020207t-05
* 3.1	List	N/A	Transportation Priorities 2008-11 Draft Staff Recommended Final Cut List	020207t-06

* Included in packet

**Distributed at meeting



METRO

DATE: February 15, 2007

TO: TPAC and Interested Parties

FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Recommended Draft Chapter 1

Attached is the recommended draft Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) recommended to guide development and analysis of the plan during Phase 3 of the RTP update. This draft addresses comments received in writing and during Metro Council and advisory committee discussions from January 5 through February 14, 2007.

Action Requested: TPAC is requested to make a recommendation to JPACT on the recommended draft Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

JPACT and the Metro Council are scheduled to take action on the recommended draft Chapter 1 and next steps on March 1 and March 15, respectively. JPACT and Metro Council approval of Resolution No. 07-3755 (For the Purpose of Endorsing the Policy Direction, Plan Goals and Objectives to Guide Development of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)) would formally begin Phase 3 of the RTP update (System Development and Analysis).

Background

In June 2006, the Metro Council and JPACT approved a 2040-based outcomes work program and process to guide RTP-related research and policy development and focused outreach activities. The outcomes-based framework relies on the eight 2040 Fundamentals as an expression of what the citizens of this region value to provide focus for what the RTP will address and monitor over time and to measure whether the plan is helping to maintain quality of life for the citizens of the region. The Regional Transportation Plan is a key tool for implementing the Region 2040 vision as expressed by the 2040 Fundamentals.

Since approval of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update work program in June 2006, staff and the ECONorthwest team conducted research on the current transportation system. The research includes:

- targeted public outreach through the website, Councilor and staff presentations to business and community groups, a series of five stakeholder workshops and public opinion research

- an analysis of current regional transportation system conditions and policies, and relevant finance, land use, environmental, economic and demographic trends.

Recommended Draft RTP Chapter 1

Two working drafts of the RTP Chapter 1 policy framework were released on January 5 and February 2, 2007, respectively, that responds to the research findings. Refinements have been made to respond to comments and issues raised by the Metro Council, Oregon Transportation Commission, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and other Metro Advisory Committees, including the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

A summary of anticipated activities that will occur during the remaining phases of the RTP update process are described below.

March to August 2007 Activities (Phase 3 – System Development and Analysis)

The updated RTP Chapter 1 policy framework will guide Phase 3 of the process from March to August 2007. Proposed Phase 3 activities include:

- Create inventory of transportation needs that responds to policy framework system design and management concepts.
- Develop case studies that apply policy framework system concepts in select locations in the region to demonstrate applicability.
- Develop performance measures for RTP systems analysis and evaluation of the policy framework system concepts in consultation with the ECONorthwest team.
- Develop revenue forecast and project solicitation process procedures and selection criteria in consultation with the ECONorthwest team.
- Solicit regional projects and program investments that best meet the Chapter 1 policy framework goals and objectives for the regional transportation system.
- Evaluate projects submitted by ODOT, TriMet, and local governments based on project solicitation procedures and selection criteria, and conduct system analysis.
- Conduct focus groups, informational presentations to business and community groups and web-based public outreach.

Recommendations from the Phase 3 analysis will be forwarded to the larger New Look process and be used to develop a discussion draft Regional Transportation Plan to be released for public comment in September 2007. Refinements may be made to the draft policy framework to address key findings and recommendations from the Phase 3 systems analysis.

September to November 2007 Activities (Phase 4 – Adoption Process)

The discussion draft RTP will be released for a formal 45-day public comment period in September 2007. Refinements will be made to the plan to address comments received. The 2035 RTP is expected to be approved by JPACT and the Metro Council in November 2007, pending air quality analysis, before the current plan expires March 6, 2008.

If you have any questions about the 2035 RTP update process, contact me at (503) 797-1617 or by e-mail at ellisk@metro.dst.or.us.

FOR THE RTP RECOMMENDED DRAFT CHAPTER 1, CLICK HERE

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERATION OF) RESOLUTION NO. 07-3786
THE REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS)
PROGRAM WORK PLAN AND FUNDING) Introduced by Rex Burkholder
SUBALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 07-08.

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation established funding levels for the Regional Travel Options Program in the 2006-2009 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program through the Transportation Priorities funding process; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved a five-year strategic plan for the Regional Travel Options Program in January 2004 that established goals and objectives for the Regional Travel Options Program; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Travel Options Subcommittee of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) adopted proposed work plans and funding sub-allocations to Metro and TriMet for Regional Travel Options program activities in fiscal year 2007-2008 on February 8, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the proposed work plans and funding sub-allocations support implementation of the Regional Travel Options Program five-year strategic plan; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council supports the Regional Travel Options Program fiscal year 2007-2008 work plans and funding sub-allocations.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 19th day of April, 2007

David Bragdon, Council President

STAFF REPORT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERATION OF REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS
PROGRAM WORK PLANS AND FUNDING SUB-ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR
2007-2008.

Date: February 15, 2007

Prepared by: Pam Peck

BACKGROUND

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) Program implements regional policy to reduce reliance on the automobile and promote alternatives to driving for all trips. The program emphasizes all alternative modes of travel and all trip purposes, reflecting policies in the Regional Transportation Plan. The Metro Council approved a five-year strategic plan for the Regional Travel Options program in 2004 that established goals and objectives for the program.

Key components of the RTO program include a collaborative marketing program, regional rideshare program, transportation management association program, and grant program that provides funds to partner agencies and organizations through a competitive project selection process. Program activities are implemented by partner organizations and agencies, as well as by Metro staff and consultant contracts administered by Metro.

The Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation established funding levels for the Regional Travel Options Program in the 2006-2009 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program through the Transportation Priorities funding process. The Regional Travel Options Subcommittee of TPAC is charged with recommending detailed work plans and funding sub-allocations to partner agencies and organizations to support program implementation activities.

The subcommittee adopted the attached proposed work plan for fiscal year 2007-2008 at their February 8, 2007 meeting. The work plan continues implementation of the program's five-year strategic plan and includes recommendations for sub-allocation of program funds to Metro, TriMet, and area transportation management associations.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition:** None.
2. **Legal Antecedents:** None.
3. **Anticipated Effects:** Provides certainty on funding sub-allocations levels for RTO partner agencies and organizations.
4. **Budget Impacts:** The proposed budget includes \$55,000 in Metro funds to match federal grant funds for that will be used to support program administration, evaluation, and regional rideshare services.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Chief Operating Officer recommends approval of Resolution 07-3786.

DRAFT

Regional Travel Options Program
FY 07/08 Workplan

Adopted by the Regional Travel Options
Subcommittee on Feb. 8, 2007



METRO

PEOPLE PLACES
OPEN SPACES

Background

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) Program implements regional policy to reduce reliance on the automobile and promote alternatives to driving for all trips. The program emphasizes all alternative modes of travel and all trip purposes, reflecting policies in the Regional Transportation Plan.

This scope of work continues implementation of the Regional Travel Options 5-Year Strategic Plan developed by the RTO subcommittee of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) in 2003. The strategic plan was adopted by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation in December 2003 and by the Metro Council in January 2004. The strategic plan established the following program goals:

Goal 1 -- Develop a collaborative marketing campaign that is an “umbrella” for all travel options programs being implemented throughout the region.

Goal 2 -- Work with senior managers to become key advocates for RTO program and funding support at TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council.

Goal 3 -- Develop performance measures for all RTO programs, evaluate the success of these programs on an annual basis and use the results to refine future program investments and marketing strategies.

Goal 4 -- Develop an integrated RTO program organizational structure that supports a more collaborative approach to Regional Travel Options program implementation and decision making.

Goal 5 -- Develop regional policies that integrate RTO programs into other regional land use and transportation programs including the Centers Program, TOD Program, Corridors program, water quality programs and TriMet’s Transit Investment Plan.

Goal 6 -- Develop a funding plan that helps create a sustainable Regional Travel Options program.

Key program objectives for fiscal year 2007-2008

- Implement year three of the Drive Less/Save More marketing campaign to raise awareness about travel options and the need to reduce single-person auto trip.
- Recommend a regional multi-year strategy for implementing individualized marketing projects to foster travel behavior change and support new infrastructure investments.
- Market rideshare services in target markets and provide incentives to increase levels of carpooling and vanpooling.
- Increase vanpool fleet from 17 to 40 vanpool groups to manage demand in congested corridors, reduce single-person auto trips, and provide access to jobs.
- Collect, analyze and report data for each RTO program to ensure that funds are invested in the most cost effective ways
- Restructure the program advisory committee structure to enhance regional coordination and decision-making related to demand management programs.

Relationship to Metro Council goals and objectives factors

The Regional Travel Options Program supports the following Metro Council goals and objectives*:

Goal 2. Environmental Health: The region's wildlife and people thrive in a healthy urban ecosystem.

Objective 2.6 Residents' health is enhanced by exceptionally clean air and water.

Motor vehicles are the largest single source of air pollution in the Portland area. The RTO program will continue to work with Oregon DEQ to monitor progress towards reducing commute trips and document the resulting air quality improvement. Stormwater runoff from street rights of way is the number one cause of water quality degradation in urban areas. Reducing the number of people driving limits the expansion of roadways, which in turns prevents the amount of impervious surface being added to watersheds.

Goal 3. Economic Vitality: Residents and businesses benefit from a strong and equitable regional economy.

Objective 3.1 Land is available to meet the need for housing and employment.

RTO strategies support economic vitality by increasing the capacity of current transportation infrastructure by providing and promoting alternatives to driving alone. RTO strategies also reduce and manage the need for parking infrastructure allowing available land to be used for housing and employment, rather than parking.

Objective 3.3 Access to jobs, services, centers and industrial areas is efficient.

The RTO program works directly with employers to find the best travel options for their employees through TriMet's Employer Outreach Program and local transportation management associations (TMAs). Services provided through the RTO program, such as carpool matching, vanpools, and transit pass programs, provide efficient access to jobs while reducing demand on the transportation system.

Objective 3.4 Stable, affordable sources of energy, combined with energy conservation, position the region for sustained economic growth and stability.

The RTO program works to reduce drive-alone trips and vehicle miles of travel resulting in decreased dependency on and consumption of fossil fuels.

Goal 4. Smart Government: Metro leads a fiscally sound, efficient and congruent system of governance where public services are funded appropriately and provided by the most suitable units of government.

Objective 4.1 Regional needs are supported by appropriate regional funding mechanisms.

The RTO program provides coordination and oversight for transportation demand management projects and programs. Metro's RTO grant program provides funds for local projects that support regional objectives related to environmental health and economic vitality.

Objective 4.3 Metro provides services that fit its distinct competency or regional scope.

Metro provides services through the Regional Travel Options program that are regional in scope including: ride-matching services to support carpooling and vanpooling, vanpool program management, regional marketing campaigns, technical assistance to agencies and organizations implementing TDM projects and programs, and evaluation of programs that receive RTO funds.

Program partners are represented on the Regional Travel Options subcommittee of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC). The subcommittee makes policy and funding recommendations related to transportation demand management and the RTO program to TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council. The group also provides a forum for regional collaboration.

Objective 4.4 There is no duplication of public services among jurisdictions

The RTO program works to find cost-effective methods to deliver services and provides ongoing coordination to eliminate duplication of effort among jurisdictions.

* The Metro Council developed a set of result-oriented goals and objectives, or outcomes, as an expression of its strategic intent for the region. The goals and objectives are available to view on Metro's web site at: www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?ArticleID=14521.

Program administration

This scope of work continues implementation of the Regional Travel Options 5-Year Strategic Plan and supports the program structure called for by the strategic plan including administration and management of RTO program functions by Metro.

The RTO program staff (.79 FTE) will:

- Chair and support RTO Subcommittee of TPAC, including logistics, scheduling and meeting summaries.
- Lead strategic planning for RTO Subcommittee and update of the strategic plan.
- RTO Subcommittee research and support on technical and financial issues.
- Develop and recommend options for restructuring the RTO subcommittee to support regional coordination of demand management programs and implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan Update.
- Create presentations about RTO program for Metro committees and regional partners.
- Administer contracts for RTO programs.
- Develop and submit FTA application for CMAQ grant funds and administer grants for RTO programs.
- Identify local matching funds sources for future years.
- Complete Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) applications and identify local pass through partner.
- Develop the RTO program budget.
- Provide local transportation system plan support on achieving 2020 non-SOV targets.
- Provide staff support for demand management and parking components of the Regional Transportation Plan Update.
- Represent RTO program at Metro committees and jurisdictions and agency meetings.

Key milestones for FY 07/08

- Dec 07 – RTO strategic plan and 08/09 work program and budget reviewed and adopted by RTO subcommittee
- Feb 08 – RTO strategic plan and 08/09 work programs and budgets reviewed and adopted by TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council
- June 08 – Submit BETC applications for FY 08/09 projects.

Deliverables

- FY 07/08 budget
- RTO subcommittee meeting summaries
- Updated strategic plan
- Quarterly progress reports

Collaborative Marketing Program

The RTO Collaborative Marketing Program coordinates all marketing and outreach efforts of the regional partners to create a broader public awareness of the travel options available to people traveling around the region and to reach new, targeted audiences. The program includes implementation of the second year of a regional marketing media and advertising campaign, TriMet's Employer Outreach Program, Wilsonville SMART's TDM Program, and coordination of local partner marketing activities.

Metro's scope of work will focus on coordination of marketing activities carried out by all RTO partners to maximize the program's reach and effectiveness. The program will leverage the state's investment in the Drive Less/Save More marketing campaign by conducting outreach at neighborhood and community events to provide campaign and local travel options information to the public, implementing earned media strategies to promote RTO projects and programs, and managing consultant contracts related to campaign implementation in partnership with ODOT.

A regional walking guide to promote walking for local trips was developed in FY 06/07 with support for printing from Kaiser Permanente. The guide will be distributed through local walking events and may be used as an incentive prize at community events in FY 07/08. Metro RTO staff will support distribution of the walking guide to program partners, earned media activities, and project evaluation. Metro RTO staff also will provide project oversight and implement marketing strategies for the regional Bike There! map, and will support coordination with regional partners around bike map development.

Metro will work with the RTO subcommittee and program stakeholders to develop and recommend a multi-year strategy for individualized marketing projects in the Portland metropolitan region. Funds for individualized marketing projects were allocated through the Transportation Priorities process in 2005 and will be available in FY 08/09. The strategy will support implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan and assist the region in meeting modal targets. The strategy will include recommended target market areas, project implementation and evaluation methodology, and a schedule and budget.

The RTO program staff (1.75 FTE), augmented by contracted professional services, will carry out the following tasks:

- Support marketing working group for effective coordination and partner communication.
- Support implementation of the Drive Less/Save More campaign through management of consultant contracts and coordination of marketing activities conducted by RTO partners.
- Develop RTO collateral materials consistent with the Drive Less/Save More campaign, including fact sheets, brochures, web pages, and other collateral materials.

- Conduct outreach for the Drive Less/Save More campaign at key community events, including fairs, festivals and farmers markets, to provide information about travel options.
- Support distribution of a regional walking guide and track project results.
- Develop regional calendar of events and coordinate presence of RTO partners.
- Provide oversight for Metro's regional Bike There! map product, implement map marketing strategies, and support collaborative with local and regional partners related to development of bike maps.
- Develop and recommend a multi-year strategy for individualized marketing projects. Forward recommendations to the RTO subcommittee, TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council.

Key milestones for FY 07-08

- July-Sept 07 -- Outreach at neighborhood and community events.
- Nov 07 – Recommend multi-year strategy for individualized marketing projects to the RTO subcommittee.
- Dec 07 – Recommend multi-year strategy for individualized marketing projects to the TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council.
- March 08 – Events calendar completed
- May to June 08 -- Outreach at neighborhood and community events.

Deliverables

- RTO collateral materials
- Regional calendar of events
- Individualized marketing strategy
- Quarterly progress reports

Regional Rideshare - Vanpool Program

This program markets carpooling and vanpooling to employers, provides web-based ride-matching services through CarpoolMatchNW.org, and provides vanpool incentives and services.

This scope of work continues implementation of a rideshare marketing strategy developed in cooperation with project stakeholders in FY 06/07. RTO staff will work with project partners at the local and regional level to market rideshare resources to employers in areas that have the best potential for increased levels of carpooling and vanpooling. The marketing strategy includes promotions that provide incentives to members of the public who participate in a carpool or vanpool three or more days per week.

Services available to employers through the RTO program include assistance identifying groups of employees that could form carpools or vanpools; collateral materials that promote the benefits of ridesharing; presentations to employee groups; financial incentives for vanpool groups; and informational tables at employee events. In addition, the RTO will work with partners in Clark Co., Washington and Columbia Co., Oregon to increase awareness of available rideshare services among residents of these areas who commute into the Portland metropolitan area.

Metro RTO staff provides customer service and administrative support for project management CarpoolMatchNW.org. The RTO program contracts with the city of Portland for web site hosting and maintenance. In FY 07/08 RTO staff will continue to work with partner organizations in Oregon and Washington to develop options for a bi-state database and online ride-matching system to support increased levels of carpooling and vanpooling.

This scope of work includes continued implementation of the vanpool pilot program strategy adopted by the RTO subcommittee in December 2006. The strategy seeks to grow the vanpool fleet from 17 to 65 vanpool groups over two years and is supported by funds from ODOT, the city of Vancouver/Clark Co., Washington, and the RTO program. The program will target markets identified in the *Rideshare Program Market Research and Implementation Plan* study completed in 2005.

Metro RTO program staff will manage lease contracts with vendors selected through a Request for Proposals process to provide vanpool services. Vendors provide vehicles for vanpool groups through a lease agreement, as well as driver screening and training. Financial incentives of up to 50% of the vehicle lease cost are available to vanpool groups. Vanpools must travel at least 20-miles roundtrip (or through a heavily congested corridor) three or more days per week to be eligible for financial incentives.

The RTO program staff (1.5 FTE), augmented by contracted professional services, will carry out the following tasks:

- Implement vanpool pilot projects in target markets in collaboration with local partners, including TMAs, with the goal of starting 23 new vanpool groups.

- Manage contracts and lease agreements with private sector vanpool vendors.
- Promote carpooling, vanpooling, and rideshare services, such as CarpoolMatchNW.org, in targeted markets.
- Develop collateral materials including fact sheets, brochures, web pages, testimonials, and other collateral.
- Provide customer service via phone and email for CarpoolMatchNW.org.
- Provide administrative support for the CarpoolMatchNW.org database.
- Provide project management for CarpoolMatchNW and work with the city of Portland to maintain the system until a bi-state or statewide service is available.
- Continue participation in development of statewide ridematching system; determine timeline for migrating the regional system to the statewide system.
- Refine targets for services and outreach.
- Track and report on program performance.
- Support rideshare working group of RTO Subcommittee for effective coordination and partner communication.

Key milestones for FY 07-08

- Dec 07 – Recommend options for providing online ride-matching services and creating a statewide and/or bi-state ride-matching database.

Deliverables

- Regional rideshare services collateral materials
- Quarterly progress reports

Transportation Management Association (TMA) Program

The TMA Program operates under the policy direction as provided in Metro Resolutions No.98-2676 and No.02-3183. TMAs are important private/public partnership tools that can be used effectively in the Central City, Regional Centers, Industrial Areas, and some Town Centers. TMAs provide important leadership in Region 2040 centers that catalyzes economic and community development, as well as development of travel options services and resources for property owners, businesses and employers.

The following TMAs provide trip reduction services to employers in the Portland metropolitan area: Clackamas Regional TMA, Gresham TMA, Lloyd TMA, Swan Island TMA, Troutdale TMA, and Westside Transportation Alliance.

RTO program staff (.3 FTE) will work with the TMAs to:

- Provide technical assistance for TMA project planning, implementation and evaluation activities.
- Develop work plans for each TMA that support the unique character of each area and recognize that each area is at a different level of development and has a unique mix of transportation infrastructure.
- Develop and manage TMA funding agreements.
- Coordinate quarterly meetings of TMA directors.
- Track TMA performance toward meeting outreach and performance targets.
- Provide progress reports to the RTO subcommittee.

Key milestones for FY 06-07

- Oct 07 – TMA directors meeting held
- Jan 08 – TMA directors meeting held
- April 08 – TMA directors meeting held
- May 08 – TMA funding agreements for FY 06-07 executed
- June 08 – TMA directors meeting held

Deliverables

- TMA agreements
- Quarterly progress reports

Regional Travel Options Grant Program

This program is administered by Metro with oversight from the RTO subcommittee. Grant funds are allocated bi-annually and fund TDM services and programs implemented by local jurisdictions, TMAs and non-profit groups located within Metro's boundary. Projects funded with RTO grants must strive to reduce the usage of single occupant vehicles and/or daily vehicle miles traveled within a specific geographic location. All projects must quantify this reduction and quantify CO2 reduction or other air quality improvements.

In FY 07/08 the program will administer the following grants awarded by the RTO subcommittee for 2007-2009:

Project	Sponsoring organization	Grant amount	Scope
Bike Commute Challenge program expansion	Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA)	\$40,000	Regional
Carefree Commuter Challenge Expansion	Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA)	\$40,000	Regional with Washington Co. focus
Employer Transportation Coordinator Training Program	Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA)	\$60,000	Local Washington Co.
Bike parking structure, enclosed and secure	Portland State University (PSU) Transportation and Parking Services	\$50,000	Local City of Portland
Healthy Active Lents walking project	Community Health Partnership	\$10,000	Local City of Portland
North Portland Location-Efficient-Living Project	Swan Island TMA	\$33,000	Local City of Portland
Gresham Transportation Options Fair	Gresham Regional Center TMA	\$11,000	Local City of Gresham
Clackamas County Bike Map Update	Clackamas County	\$35,218	Local Clackamas Co.
Carsharing study	City of Lake Oswego	\$5,000	Local City of Lake Oswego
SmartTrips Milwaukie individualized marketing project	Cities of Portland and Milwaukie	\$65,000	Local City of Milwaukie

RTO program staff (.3 FTE) will carry out the following tasks to support the grant program:

- Provide technical assistance to grantees related to project management, implementation, and evaluation.
- Administer grant funding agreements.
- Provide progress reports to the RTO subcommittee.

Key milestones for FY 07-08

- Each project will submit quarterly progress reports to Metro as outlined in the grant agreement.

Deliverables

- Quarterly progress reports

Evaluation Program

This program collects, analyzes and reports data for each RTO program to ensure that RTO program funds are invested in the most cost effective ways. An annual evaluation report is used to refine program development, marketing and implementation to ensure that limited program dollars are invested in the most cost effective ways.

RTO program staff will be responsible for ongoing and consistent data collection and tracking. An evaluation working group formed in FY 06/07 will recommend a framework for evaluating RTO programs to the RTO subcommittee in April 2007. The framework will include proposed evaluation measures for all RTO funded programs, a schedule for evaluation reporting, and recommend roles and responsibilities for the various agencies and organizations involved in collecting and analyzing program data.

This scope of work assumes that Metro RTO program staff will have primary responsibility for data analysis and evaluation, and that Metro's Travel Research and Modeling staff and Data Resource Center staff will assist with the development of new data tracking tools. In addition, the scope assumes that a public awareness survey will be developed and fielded to establish baseline information about awareness of RTO messages and programs. The scope of work will be amended to implement the evaluation framework adopted by the RTO subcommittee.

The Metro staff (1.109 FTE) will:

- Conduct on going data collection and tracking for all RTO funded programs.
- Implement evaluation framework adopted by the RTO subcommittee.
- Develop and field a regional public awareness survey to establish baseline information about public awareness of travel options messages, as well as awareness of and satisfaction with RTO programs.
- Create a central database for the RTO program that can be used in conjunction with other regional travel behavior data to monitor each program component.
- Develop a set of prediction factors that would be used to select RTO programs for implementation based on cost-effectiveness and ability to achieve desired program impacts.

Key milestones for FY 07-08

- Milestone dates to be determined based on evaluation framework adopted by the RTO subcommittee in April 2007.

Deliverables

- Program effectiveness prediction factors.
- Central database completed.

Budget

07-08 RTO Revenue

FFY 07 MTIP categories

RTO Program	\$883,000
TriMet Employer Program	\$195,000
TriMet Regional Evaluation	\$100,000
Carryover CMAQ (FFY 06 MTIP)	\$463,535

Total grant revenue

Other program revenue sources

ODOT DLSM marketing funds	\$1,000,000
ODOT Vanpool development funds	\$82,500
Clark Co. Vanpool funds	\$187,950
BETC (expected to be received in 07-08)	\$17,109
Metro excise tax funds	55,000
Local match (partners)	97,229

Total other sources

Total revenues	\$3,081,323
-----------------------	--------------------

07-08 RTO Expenses	FTA Grant	Match/Metro	Match/Local	Clark Co CTR	ODOT	Total
Program administration						
Metro FTE (.790)	88,832	10,168				99,000
Materials and services (dues, travel, training)	7,178	822				8,000
Total program administration	96,010	10,990				107,000
Collaborative marketing						
Drive Less/Save More Marketing Campaign					1,000,000	1,000,000
Metro FTE (1.75 FTE)	142,351	16,293				158,644
Materials and services (printing, collateral, contracted services)	40,379	4,621				45,000
TriMet Employer Program	374,000		42,863			416,863
SMART TDM Program (\$60,500 for FY 08 received in FY 07)	0		0			
Oregon Department Energy (\$54,000 received in FY 07)	0		0			
Total collaboration marketing	556,730	20,914	42,863		1,000,000	1,620,507
RTO Grant Program						
2007-2009 grants plus FTE	250,000		28,614			278,614
<i>Metro FTE (.3)</i>	38,584	4,416				43,000
Total grant program	288,584	4,416	28,614			321,614
Transportation Management Assoc (TMA) Program						
Existing TMAs (6)	150,000		17,168			167,168
TMA start-ups (1 at year one subsidy)	75,000		8,584			83,584
<i>Metro FTE (.3)</i>	38,584	4,416				43,000
Total TMA program	263,584	4,416	25,752			293,752
Regional Rideshare Program						
Vanpool incentives (50% of lease costs, does not require match)	69,000	0		138,000	75,000	282,000
Metro FTE vanpool operations (.5 FTE requires 20% match)	22,800	5,700		28,500		57,000
Metro FTE rideshare marketing (1 FTE, does not require match)	69,183	0				69,183
Materials and services (marketing, does not require match)	70,126	0		21,450	7,500	99,076
CarpoolMatch NW (maintenance)	30,000	0				30,000
Total regional rideshare program	261,109	5,700		187,950	82,500	537,259
Evaluation						
Metro FTE (.950 RTO, .144 DRC, .015 TRMS = 1.109 total FTE)	107,461	9,875				117,336
Materials and services (contracted professional services)	68,055	7,789				75,844
Total evaluation and tracking	175,516	17,664				193,180
Program total	1,641,533	66,565	97,229	187,950	1,082,500	3,075,777

(Budget note: Metro FTE totals 5.759 FTE)

**Metro Regional Travel Options Grants
2007-2009**

Grantee	Project	Award	Stipulations
City of Portland Office of Transportation, Options Division/City of Milwaukie	SmartTrips Milwaukie individualized marketing to 3,400 households in Milwaukie (bounded by city boundary to the north, SE Stanley and SE 45th ave to the east, SE King and SE Harrison, Monroe, and Washington to the south and Hwy 99 to the west).	\$65,000	Need to do new pre and post survey specific to Milwaukie. Grant award includes \$15,000 to cover these costs.
Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA)	Bike Commute Challenge Expansion -- Expand program in Portland area by 50% through website improvements and expanded outreach to large employers.	\$40,000	Expand staff time for outreach at large worksites across the region. Grant award includes \$10,000 to cover these costs.
Portland State University Transportation and Parking Services	Long-term secure, enclosed bike parking structure located on the east end of campus at SW 4th and Jackson.	\$50,000	None
Westside Transportation Alliance	Carefree Commuter Challenge Expansion -- Expand outreach in Washington County focused on Beaverton, Hillsboro and Washington Square and support regional implementation of campaign by other TMAs.	\$40,000	None
Swan Island Transportation Management Association	North Portland Location Efficient Living Project -- Promote housing opportunities in North Portland to Swan Island employees and promote job opportunities on Swan Island to North Portland residents.	\$33,000	Conduct research to determine where Swan Island employees are living now and if they own or rent. Grant award includes \$8,000 to cover these costs.
City of Lake Oswego	Car Sharing in Downtown Lake Oswego Town Center feasibility study	\$5,000	Partial award of \$5,000 for feasibility study. Study must be conducted by an independent group.
Clackamas County, Department of Transportation and Development	Clackamas County Bike Map Update (project will completed with assistance from Metro DRC and in conjunction with 2007 Bike There! map update).	\$35,218	None
Westside Transportation Alliance	TDM Training for Employer Transportation Coordination and Professionals	\$60,000	Tentative award of \$60,000 conditioned on reformulation of proposal with input from DEQ, TriMet and area TMAs. RTO subcommittee to approve final award upon review of revised proposal.
Community Health Partnership	Healthy Active Lents -- Grant funds will support travel options outreach at Lents Farmers' Market and development of coupon book to encourage walking to local businesses.	\$10,000	Partial award of \$10,000 to be used for coupon book with tracking of effectiveness and outreach at farmers' market.
Gresham Regional Center, TMA	Gresham Transportation Options Fair -- In conjunction with the Teddy Bear Parade, a family event in downtown Gresham, grant funds will support bike helmet giveaways and installation of additional bike racks in downtown.	\$11,000	Partial award of \$11,000 to be used for bike helmet giveaways for youth and installation of bike racks in downtown Gresham.
Totals		\$ 349,218	

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE)	RESOLUTION NO. 07-3755
POLICY DIRECTION AND DRAFT PLAN)	
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TO GUIDE)	Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder,
DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2035 REGIONAL)	Councilor Brian Newman and Councilor Rod
TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP))	Park

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) approved Resolution 06-3661 for the Purpose of Approving A Work Program For the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update and Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend Contract No. 926975 on June 15, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the RTP is the federally recognized transportation policy for the Portland metropolitan region and threshold for all federal transportation funding in the region that must be updated every four years; and

WHEREAS, the RTP fulfills statewide planning requirements to implement Goal 12 Transportation, as implemented through the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule, and must be updated every 5 to 7 years; and

WHEREAS, the RTP is a central tool for implementing the Region 2040 Growth Concept, and constitutes a policy component of the Regional Framework Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region is at an important crossroads in terms of maintaining, designing, funding and building a multi-modal transportation system so that our region continues to thrive; and

WHEREAS, the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region is a global transportation gateway and West Coast domestic hub for trade and tourism – and our region’s economy is especially trade-dependent; and

WHEREAS, congestion threatens to harm our economy and livability, costing both families and businesses millions of dollars a year; and

WHEREAS, stakeholder outreach and public opinion research inform us that residents want their transportation system to be balanced, safe, environmentally sustainable, and support the economy, prioritize maintenance over new construction, provide access to all people, and encourage livable communities; and

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan region is well-positioned with balanced transportation and land use systems in place, and if we continue investing in them accordingly our region will continue to uphold residents’ values and achieve economic prosperity; and

WHEREAS, this important work begins with updating the RTP Chapter 1 policy framework in a manner that continues to recognize that land use decisions and transportation planning are inextricably linked and that transportation investment is a powerful tool to support the economy and promote efficient land use; and

WHEREAS, a recommended draft Chapter 1 policy framework that responds to the powerful trends and challenges affecting the region, stakeholder outreach, public opinion research and comments

received from Metro Advisory Committees, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, the Oregon Transportation Commission and Federal Highway Administration Division Office staff between January 5 and February 14, 2007 is set forth in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, this policy framework delivers and promotes a balanced transportation system that is well-maintained, reliable and safe for all modes of travel, new road and transit capacity, continuous networks of bikeways and pedestrian facilities, strategies to optimize system performance to manage congestion and improve safety, mobility, community livability, economic prosperity, clean air and protection of the natural environment; and

WHEREAS, this RTP will focus on transportation-related actions that implement the Region 2040 Growth Concept and prioritize projects based on how they deliver the outcomes that affect people's lives, commerce and the quality of life in this region to achieve optimum return on public investment; and

WHEREAS, because the region's ability to expand capacity is limited due to fiscal, environmental and land use constraints, this RTP will use level-of-service (LOS) as an indicator of system reliability and service conditions for moving people and freight, and employ new, multi-modal system design concepts and performance measures to evaluate new road and transit capacity, sidewalks, bikeways and other needed transportation infrastructure and services; and

WHEREAS, although this RTP will be developed to acknowledge fiscal constraints, it is also recognized by the Metro Council and JPACT that more transportation funding is needed than is currently available, and that the Metro Council intends to work with other public agencies, interest groups and the business community to pursue more transportation funding for the region into order to realize our transportation aspirations; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Metro Council and JPACT endorse the policy direction and draft plan goals and objectives to guide development of the 2035 RTP, identified in Exhibit "A."
2. Approval of this resolution initiates Phase 3 of the RTP update.
3. Refinements to "Exhibit A" may be identified to address key findings identified during Phase 3 of the RTP update.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____th day of ____2007.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 07-3755, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORING THE POLICY DIRECTION AND DRAFT PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TO GUIDE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

Date: February 20, 2007

Prepared by: Kim Ellis

BACKGROUND

Metro is the regional government responsible for regional land use and transportation planning under state law and the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. As the MPO, Metro is charged with developing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that defines regional transportation policies that will guide transportation system investments in the Portland metropolitan region needed to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept. The RTP must be updated at least every 4 years, and be consistent with guiding federal, state, and regional transportation and land use policy and requirements. The RTP also serves as the threshold for all federal transportation funding in the Portland metropolitan region and describes how federal and state funds for transportation projects and programs will be spent in the region. An MPO must create an RTP that identifies the transportation investments it will make with those funds for at least a 20-year planning period, consistent with federal and state air quality requirements.

The Metro Council initiated the 2035 RTP Update on September 22, 2005 with approval of Resolution #05-3610A (for the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the “Budgeting for Outcomes” Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities).). On June 15, 2006, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) initiated Phase 2 of the 2035 RTP update with approval of Resolution 06-3661 (For the Purpose of Approving A Work Program For the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update and Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend Contract No. 926975).

The RTP is a key tool for implementing the Region 2040 vision as expressed by the 2040 Fundamentals. The 2035 RTP update work program and process relies on the eight 2040 Fundamentals as an expression of what the citizens of this region value to provide focus for what the RTP will address and monitor over time and to measure whether the plan is helping to maintain quality of life for the citizens of the region.

The 2035 RTP update represents the first significant update to the plan in six years. The update is anticipated to be complete by November 2007 to allow adequate time to complete air quality conformity analysis and federal consultation before the current plan expires on March 6, 2008.

Phase 2: Research and Policy Development (June 2006 to March 2007)

Since approval of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update work program in June 2006, staff and the ECONorthwest team conducted research on the current transportation system. The research includes:

- targeted public outreach through the website, Councilor and staff presentations to business and community groups, a series of five stakeholder workshops and public opinion research,

- an analysis of current regional transportation system conditions and policies, and relevant finance, land use, environmental, economic and demographic trends.

Recommended Draft RTP Chapter 1 policy framework

Two working drafts of the RTP Chapter 1 policy framework were released on January 5 and February 2, 2007, respectively, that respond to the research findings, stakeholder outreach and public opinion research. Refinements have been made to respond to comments and issues raised by the Metro Council, Oregon Transportation Commission, Federal Highway Administration Division Office staff, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and other Metro Advisory Committees, including the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). The comments and recommended refinements are summarized in Attachment 1.

Phase 3: System Development and Analysis (March to August 2007)

Approval of this resolution will initiate Phase 3 of the RTP update. The updated RTP Chapter 1 policy framework will guide Phase 3 of the process from March to August 2007. Phase 3 activities include:

- Create inventory of transportation needs that responds to policy framework system design and management concepts.
- Develop case studies that apply policy framework system concepts in select locations in the region to demonstrate applicability.
- Develop performance measures for RTP systems analysis and evaluation of the policy framework system concepts.
- Develop revenue forecast and project solicitation process procedures and selection criteria.
- Solicit regional projects and program investments that best meet the Chapter 1 policy framework goals and objectives for the regional transportation system.
- Evaluate projects submitted by ODOT, TriMet, and local governments based on project solicitation procedures and selection criteria, and conduct system analysis.
- Conduct focus groups, informational presentations to business and community groups and web-based public outreach.

Recommendations from the Phase 3 analysis will be forwarded to the larger New Look process and be used to develop a discussion draft Regional Transportation Plan to be released for public comment in September 2007. Refinements may be made to the draft policy framework to address key findings and recommendations from the Phase 3 systems analysis.

Phase 4: Adoption Process (September to November 2007)

The discussion draft RTP will be released for a formal 45-day public comment period in September 2007. Public hearings will be held around the region. Refinements will be made to the plan to address comments received. MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council action on the recommended 2035 RTP, will be pending air quality analysis to be conducted during Phase 5.

Phase 5: Air Quality Conformity Analysis (December 2007 to February 2008)

The financially constrained system of projects and programs will be analyzed for effects on air quality to demonstrate the recommended 2035 RTP financially constrained system of projects conform to the Clean Air Act. A 30-day public comment period will be held on the analysis and subsequent conformity determination to gather input. Staff will seek approval of the conformity determination and RTP planning process from Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration by March 6, 2008, when current plan expires.

Post-RTP Adoption Activities and Periodic Review

The New Look planning process may recommend refinements to the 2040 design types and investment priorities as it moves forward to prepare for Metro's next periodic review. Refinements will be addressed to the extent possible in this RTP update, but may also be addressed during future amendments or updates to the RTP.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition** - No known opposition.
- 2. Legal Antecedents** - On September, 22, 2006, the Metro Council initiated Phase 1 (Scoping) to update the RTP with approval of Resolution #05-3610A (For the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the "Budgeting for Outcomes" Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities). On June 15, 2006, the Metro Council initiated Phase 2 of the 2035 RTP update with approval of Resolution 06-3661 (For the Purpose of Approving A Work Program For the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update and Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend Contract No. 926975). The RTP update fulfills both state and federal transportation planning requirements, and will result in continued compliance with federal regulations that require the RTP to be updated at least every four years, and state regulations that require the RTP to be updated every 5 to 7 years.
- 3. Anticipated Effects** – This resolution endorses the policy direction and draft goals and objectives to be used to develop the 2035 RTP during Phase 3. Approval of this resolution will initiate Phase 3 of the process.
- 4. Budget Impacts** - None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 07-3755.

ATTACHMENT 1
Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755



METRO

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0
Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations
(comments received January 5 through February 14, 2007)

This document summarizes comments received in writing and during discussions of the Metro Council, Metro advisory committees and the Oregon Transportation Commission. Except where noted, recommendations were incorporated into the Recommended Draft (dated February 15, 2007).

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
1.	Expand preface to describe proposed changes from cover memo and rationale for a new approach for the RTP	Metro Council	Added language.
2.	Vision is over used throughout overview – 2040 is the vision. Add language that RTP is also a capital plan, implementation strategy and binding document that directs expenditures in the region.	Metro Council	Added language and reference to Chapter 1 as a policy framework.
3.	Vision section needs to be clear and focused. Subsequent sections should flow from vision to goals to objectives and performance measures	City of Beaverton	Added language.
4.	Expand notion of economic competitiveness beyond the region to be “global competitiveness.” The Portland region’s transportation system is critical to the state’s economy and global competitiveness and serves as a global gateway for trade and tourism.	Oregon Transportation Commission, Freight Task Force	Added text to this effect in executive summary and new Goal 2.
5.	Page 1 - Add “and threatens the environment and quality of life” to the first bullet	Metro Council	Added language.
6.	Define the major transportation system (page 3)	City of Tualatin and City of Milwaukie	Changed text to refer to “regional transportation system” and added definition to glossary.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755**Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0***Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)*

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
7.	Add language to the preface that the region now has a better understanding of the relationship between an efficient transportation system and economic health.	Port of Portland	Added language.
8.	Expand notion of economic competitiveness beyond the region to be “global competitiveness.”	Oregon Transportation Commission, Freight Task Force	Added text to this effect. in preface and new Goal 2.
9.	Clarify the goals and measurable objectives are provisional to be used to analyze RTP scenarios and may be refined based on findings from this research.	Metro Council	New language to be added describing this. Currently addressed in cover memo.
10.	Add language to the preface that the region now has a better understanding of the relationship between an efficient transportation system and economic health.	Port of Portland	Added language.
11.	Clarify that RTP vision recognizes that some capacity investments will be necessary.	TPAC workshop, Freight Task Force, Oregon Transportation Commission, JPACT	Added new language describing this.
12.	Memo, Page 3 - First bullet describes a reasonable approach for transit, but may be incomplete. Overlapping radial systems make sense, especially on the Westside where a grid system is not easily carved out, but only if and when centers mature to the point where they can generate enough demand. A roadway network that is relatively complete and more grid-like, however, is preferred as it affords easy transfers at route intersections and allows travel from almost any point to almost any point without out-of-direction travel through a center. We suggest rephrasing this description to something more like: "The transit system map will be expanded to reflect a design and management approach for providing service that allows convenient movement to, from, and between 2040 centers. In parts of the region where development focuses on centers, the approach will move more toward providing radial systems serving centers, with overlap and connections providing the complex web of transit options necessary to serve growing demand. In areas where development focuses on Mainstreets and within larger regional centers, the approach	Trimet	Added language to executive summary and transit concept sections as proposed.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	will be to complete grid systems allowing convenient transfers for multi-destination trips."		
13.	Memo Page 3 - First bullet describes a reasonable approach for transit, which TriMet has been moving to since the early 1980's as we developed regional transit centers and more crosstown bus service. The description in the rationale is misleading. Suggest new wording as follows: " Significant growth in population and jobs in the areas outside the Central City are difficult to serve with the Central City focused hub-and-spoke system that developed for most of the 20th century. Beginning in the 1980's with a major redesign of the eastside bus routes and continued development of transit centers throughout the region, TriMet began to respond to changing travel patterns in the region. This statement represents a deepening commitment to this approach, especially in parts of the region outside the older neighborhoods of Portland's eastside, where the road infrastructure and topography do not easily lend themselves to such a grid system. RTP background research demonstrated growing demand and desire for a web of convenient travel service connections between suburban areas of the region that remain also linked to the Central City. This is also consistent with dispersing travel patterns and more demand for transit trips that do not involve the Central City throughout the country, even though Central City demand remains high. The RTP vision retains...." (continue as written originally)"	Trimet	Added language to executive summary and transit concept sections as proposed.
14.	It is difficult to find the transportation focus in this opening chapter of the Regional Transportation Plan. The current focus is about land use and attaining land use goals through other means, specifically by controlling transportation. A transportation plan should first and foremost include transportation goals, and meet transportation needs while also considering other factors and needs, such as land use, human health, and the environment.	FHWA	The draft framework is very much about the regional transportation system and its role in shaping our communities and our region to achieve the Region 2040 vision. In the Portland metropolitan region, the RTP serves as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan under federal law, but also as a regional transportation system plan under state law and a regional functional plan under the Metro charter. All of the goals and measurable objectives represent goals for

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			the <u>regional transportation system</u> that recognize that investments in the transportation system cannot be made in isolation and need to go beyond merely “considering other factors and needs such as land use, human health and the environment.” We believe recent changes in federal legislation – including approval of SAFETEA-LU and efforts to better link NEPA and transportation planning - support more meaningfully addressing these important, and publicly valued, components of our region in addition to the economy, which was not mentioned in your comments. Language has been added to the Version 2.0 draft to further emphasize this focus.
15.	Clarify transportation decisions are land use decisions and vice-versa.	Metro Council	Added language to executive summary and following Table 1.
16.	Ethics of sustainability overlap with 2040 Fundamentals and are confusing given public outreach focused on the 2040 Fundamentals	ODOT	Deleted section.
17.	Map the eight goals back to the 2040 fundamentals for consistency and clarity.	ODOT	Added new Table 4 showing how RTP goals relate to 2040 Fundamentals.
18.	Employment areas should be considered a secondary priority land use	TPAC workshop	Revised Table 1.
19.	The land use design types listed do not match Metro’s own hierarchy of 2040 design types, which only identifies the Central City, Regional Centers, Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIAs), and Intermodal Facilities as Primary land use components. Other Industrial Areas, Station Communities, Town Centers, Main Streets and Corridors are secondary land use components. <u>Employment Areas rank last</u> along with Inner and Outer neighborhoods. In addition, the list of priority land use design types is simply too long to meaningfully prioritize transportation investments. There is likely not enough money to meet the transportation needs of all the Regional Centers, RSIAs and Intermodal	ODOT	Added new language added to clarify recommended investment priorities. Moved employment areas to secondary land use components. Application of this hierarchy to new urban areas with adopted concept plans is also described.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	Facilities, let alone the secondary or tertiary land use components. Metro must decide what its policy is for prioritizing between investments that benefit certain land use design types, between developed, urban areas and newly urbanizing areas, and between intraregional circulation versus mobility of through traffic.		
20.	Page 3, second paragraph: We agree that generally transportation is a means to an end, not a goal in itself. However, the description of Quality of Life seems incomplete: people do value the ability to get to all the wonderful things the region and the state have to offer. The proximity and accessibility of the natural, cultural, community and social amenities of the region are very much part of the quality of life, and this has been expressed in some of the workshops we have attended. Conversely, congestion is seen as a detriment to quality of life.	ODOT	New language added to connect quality of life impacts to congestion.
21.	Page 6, third paragraph: the bulleted items are called “outcomes”, but it is not clear what the purpose of this paragraph is. It seems to be yet another listing of the same words that are found under sustainability, 2040 fundamentals, and RTP Goals.	ODOT	Deleted bulleted items as they are repetitive of goal statements that followed.
22.	Expand 2040 Fundamental #2 that a healthy economy also supports the region’s gateway function for the rest of the state.”	Port of Portland	Added this idea to new Goal 2 , Objective 2.2 and the preface.
23.	Clarify that the primary mission of the RTP is to support and implement the region 2040 vision, not managing growth.	Port of Portland and JPACT	Added language to overview in Section 1 and after Table 2.
24.	Include Institutions in list 2040 Design Types throughout document (Table 1, 2040 Fundamentals, Objective 1.1, Objective 1.3, Objective 3.2.1, Objective 3.2.4, and Objective 7.3).	Thomasina Gabrielle	No change. This comment has been forwarded to the New Look process. The RTP responds to the current 2040 design types – which does not specifically call out institutions.
25.	Chapter 1, Page 1 - Paragraph after the quote, first sentence. Suggest simplifying to: "This preamble to the Metro Charter, especially the emphasized passage above, lays the groundwork...". (continue as before)	TriMet	Revised language as proposed.
26.	Page 4 - Just a note that may be worth stating. The 6 fundamentals all fit into the RTP in terms of providing access	TriMet	Added language as suggested.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	and mobility, but access (e.g., enabling good clustering of land uses, walkability, etc.) is different from mobility (driving, even transit in some ways). The distinction can get lost.		
27.	Table 1 - a new category is needed for “regionally significant industrial areas” and for “intermodal facilities” to guide the RTP. They can still be Primary Land Use Components, but they have such different needs than the Central City and Regional Centers, we’re fooling ourselves to try to lump them together. Suggest Primary Industrial/Employment (which would incorporate Regionally significant industrial areas, as well as all freight-focused intermodal facilities) be separated from Primary Mixed-Use (Central City, Regional Centers and passenger focused intermodal facilities). Also, provide some clarity for where passenger-focused facilities like PDX and Union Station come in.	TriMet	Added language and definitions to address this comment.
28.	Clarify “regional” system includes: limited-access facilities (throughways), regional and community arterials, regional transit service as defined in the draft and bike and pedestrian facilities on all regional streets.	TPAC workshop and Lake Oswego	Added this definition to the glossary and text and expanded to include freight rail, marine and air systems.
29.	Describe RTP vision for the local street system in more detail. Clarify role of local and collector streets in supporting the larger regional system.	TPAC workshop	Added current RTP language.
30.	Clarify what parts of the policy framework apply to local transportation system plans (TSPs)	TPAC workshop	Added language that entire chapter directs all transportation planning and project development activities in the Portland metropolitan region, and are therefore enforceable in local transportation system plans.
31.	Freight rail needs to be a key part of the RTP as well as freight movement <u>to</u> the region, not just within the region.	Oregon Transportation Commission	Added language on the importance of rail connections in the executive summary and new Goal 2. Forwarded comment to the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Plan effort, which will more specifically address freight rail needs in the region and make recommendations to the RTP process.
32.	The plan should allow for highway expansion as a viable	FHWA	Agreed. The proposed framework does not

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p>alternate. The transportation solution for a large and vibrant metropolitan region like Metro should include additional highway capacity options along with maximizing use of the existing system and land use choices.</p>		<p>preclude “highway capacity options” as suggested in this comment. The RTP policy framework, similar to the Oregon Transportation Plan, is focused on maximizing the efficiency of the existing system prior to expanding right-of-way. New road and capacity construction is an important option after system management, demand management and land use strategies are exhausted.</p>
33.	<p>The plan should acknowledge that automobiles are the preferred mode of transport by the citizens of Portland...they vote with their cars everyday.</p>	FHWA	<p>Added language to the executive summary to better explain trends and research findings related to this comment. The RTP does acknowledge that automobiles are the preferred mode of transportation for the majority of the residents of the Portland metropolitan region as evidenced by current mode shares in the region. However, SAFETEA-LU, the Oregon Transportation Plan and the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule require the provision of multi-modal transportation options that includes walking, bicycling and transit to respond to transportation needs of people who cannot rely on the automobile to get around. The importance of this strategy was re-affirmed in our scientific public opinion research and series of stakeholder workshops that we conducted.</p> <p>The RTP has a responsibility to all the residents of the region – and not everyone in the region can afford to own and operate a car. In addition, U.S. census data shows a significant portion of the region is under the age of 18 and increasingly over the age of 65. System balance, as proposed in the current plan and emphasized in the policy framework, is also important to that</p>

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			relationship because it relieves the burden off any one mode of travel – most notably highways and regional arterials, and helps keeps business and commerce moving reliably. Finally, our last travel behavior survey demonstrated that if people have convenient options other than driving they will use them.
34.	The plan should not make sweeping statements about fewer funds available now than in the past. There are more funds in federal programs with each passing reauthorization.	FHWA	Language has been added to the executive summary of the draft framework to better explain the trends and research findings related to this comment. Despite more funds being included with each passing reauthorization, the point being made is that Federal and state transportation sources are not keeping up with growing needs for a variety of reasons. Federal funding in this region has gradually declined since the 1950s when states such as Oregon received 90 cents of federal money for every 10 cents a state spent on interstate highways. In addition, at current spending levels and without new sources of funding, the federal highway trust fund is anticipated to go broke in 2009. State purchasing power is steadily declining because the gas tax hasn't increased since 1993 and is not indexed to keep up with inflation. Combined with rising prices for all petroleum products—not just fuel—the funding situation in this region (and state) has risen to crisis levels.
35.	Create separate goals for Compact Urban form and Economic competitiveness.	Metro Council, TPAC workshop, JPACT, ODOT, City of Beaverton, Washington County,	Added new Goal 2 on sustainable economic competitiveness and prosperity.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
		Freight Task Force, Sreya Sarkar (TPAC citizen), TriMet	
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move objectives 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 to new Economic prosperity and global competitiveness goal. • The importance of mobility and the economy are described well in the text, but the framework lacks objectives that tie the two topics. • There needs to be clear illustration of how the Transportation system implied by these policies will positively contribute to a Healthy Economy 	TPAC workshop and Washington County	Changed objective 1.2 to new Goal 2 and moved Objective 1.4 to be under new Goal 2.
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be clearer policy guidance regarding priorities for investments. • How should the RTP phase/prioritize investments to achieve desired “end state” and still be flexible throughout sub-areas of region? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What criteria should be used to prioritize investments—does network concept leave behind or support investments in centers and other 2040 priority land uses (e.g., industry) as well as bike and pedestrian improvements? • How should critical freight connections be defined and investments prioritized? Performance measures for freight but without a freight corridor definition, what is a freight improvement over any other type, how do you prioritize? • What is the hierarchy of system links within the network concept and 2040 uses overall? Main streets are important and have competing service needs and design challenges. • What is the process for prioritizing projects and how will jurisdictions be involved? 	TPAC workshop, JPACT, ODOT, Oregon Transportation Commission, Clackamas County and City of Beaverton	Added new language from current RTP and advisory committee discussions to establish priorities. The objectives establish investment priorities within each goal. The highest priority investments would be those that are cost-effective and meet multiple goals and objectives. Language has been added to describe this better.
38.	Transportation management goals should define peak and off-peak travel time objectives.	City of Tualatin	Added to Objective 4.1.
39.	Describe how person-trip capacity will be defined.	City of Tualatin	This measure is under development and will be further defined during Phase 3. It will rely

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			on current measures of capacity and volumes for a specific corridor.
40.	Consider measures on non-freight product or value of products for Objective 1.2	City of Tualatin	To be addressed by Regional Freight TAC during Phase 3.
41.	Clarify Objectives 3.2.6 and 3.2.7 for bike and pedestrian facilities apply to regional streets, not all streets.	TPAC workshop and Lake Oswego	Added “regional” to the text.
42.	Need to balance between development of existing centers and new centers; UGB expansion; [current framework puts] repeated reference to "compact urban centers" puts too much emphasis on existing centers at the expense of new centers; too much emphasis may encourage inappropriate infill and push growth outside the UGB	City of Gresham	Updated goal 1 to focus on great communities, of which compact urban form is a part, and added language describing Table 1 as applying to existing UGB and UGB expansion areas with adopted concept plans.
43.	Add street car to objective 3.2.4	Michael Powell, Freight Task Force	Added language.
44.	Page 20, Goal 7: the Goal statement uses the words “maximize public investment in infrastructure”. Is the intent here to say “maximize <u>return on</u> public investment”?	ODOT	Revised text as proposed.
45.	Page 20, Objective 7.3: there needs to be more clear direction and performance measures for protecting public investments in transportation. This is where the Region needs to take a policy position about access management on both throughways and arterials. There should be a policy that there will be no interchange improvements without an Interchange Area Management Plan.	ODOT	These are important actions and implementation strategies that will be have been added as potential actions that will be refined during Phase 3 of the process.
46.	Page 21, Goal 8 and Objective 8.1: representative decision-making should encompass much more than geographic distribution of JPACT and MPAC. There should also be mention of representation by gender, age, race, minority status, income, and stakeholder interest (e.g., business, freight, neighborhoods). Accountability does not seem to be the right word for the notion of a seamless system that this Goal covers. The OTP refers to this as “an integrated transportation system across jurisdictions, ownerships and modes”.	ODOT	Goal 8 is intended to get at the notion of a seamless system. This goal is calling out the idea that it is the collective responsibility of the system owners and operators to ensure that happens as part of being accountable to residents and businesses in the region. Additional proposed measures under Objective 8.1 will be developed.
47.	Objectives 1.1 and 7.3 speak to reinforcing growth in certain land use areas, but does not actually state that	ODOT	Added new language to establish priorities.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	transportation investments that serve those areas are a higher priority than investments that do not serve “centers, industrial areas, intermodal facilities, corridors and employment areas”.		
48.	Goal 1: Compact Urban Form seems vague in its intent, referring to “integrated decisions” rather than a transportation system that supports a compact urban form.	ODOT	Refined goal and objective language to be more specific.
49.	Page 7, Objective 1.5: Travel Choices: this does not belong under Compact Urban Form and Economic Competitiveness. Maybe Travel Choice is a Goal in itself, with both a person travel and freight component.	ODOT	Moved Objective 1.5 to under Goal 3 and added new objective to new .Goal 2 addressing freight travel choices.
50.	Page 9, Mobility and Reliability Goal: The title of this goal is not reflected in the underlying text, which only talks about connectivity and travel choices. The goal should to address the movement of people and goods.	ODOT	Revised title of goal to be “Reliable People and Goods Movement.”
51.	Page 9, Mobility and Reliability: Objective 3.1 and 1.4 are duplicative. Access to industrial areas and through movement of freight should be addressed under this goal, as well as the economic costs of congestion.	ODOT	Deleted objective 3.1.
52.	Goal 3 Mobility and Reliability – While Mobility is identified in the Goal, it doesn’t seem to show up in the policies at all. And what happened to accessibility? Please don't just jettison old terms and adopt new ones. Keep old ones, and make sure ALL terms have clear definitions that all can understand.	Washington County	Expanded glossary and added language on accessibility.
53.	Page 9, Goal 3: the Goal is about Mobility and Reliability, yet all the Objectives are about Connectivity. While connectivity is a good thing, it is not sufficient to address mobility. The connectivity objectives and measures must be supplemented with measures for mobility 1) to demonstrate that the system will actually work; 2) to comply with the Oregon Highway Plan, and 3) to guide transportation investment decisions in all those instances where a fully connective multimodal system does not exist and is not likely to be developed due to existing land use, topographic, and/or environmental constraints, and 4) to prioritize investment decisions between now and the buildout of the envisioned fully connected system.	ODOT	Added new objective for system connectivity, mobility, system management, and demand management.. Measures from Freight TAC work will be incorporated into performance measures.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p>Specifically, Objective 3.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.5 on page 9 must include specific measures recommended by the Freight TAC and Task Force. The “percent of industrial areas and intermodal facilities served by direct arterial connections to throughways” is an accessibility measure, not a connectivity measure. What does “direct arterial connection” mean? ODOT supports inclusion of a measure of accessibility for industrial areas and intermodal facilities, but this should be expressed in terms of travel time (not as a percentage), and should be supplemented with a measure for through mobility on key regional freight routes. For businesses and freight interests it is not enough to physically be able to get to the freeway – they have to be able to do so reliably, in a reasonable amount of time, and they must be able to maintain a certain reasonable travel speed once on the freeway, at least during off-peak times.</p>		
54.	<p>It is not clear how the proposed alternative measures will apply to facility design. There is language under “Street Design Elements” on page 12 to suggest that freeways and highways should be 4-6 lanes, and Regional Arterials should be four lanes, but the language appears to be descriptive rather than directive. There is no clear legal policy language (i.e. Goal, Objective, or Performance Measure language) addressing street design.</p> <p>Page 9, Goal 3: the street design concepts on page 12 should be expressed in terms of Policy (Goal, Objective, or Performance Measure) language in order to be legally enforceable.</p>	ODOT	<p>Added language that entire chapter directs all transportation planning and project development activities in the Portland metropolitan region, and are therefore enforceable in local transportation system plans. In addition, added new language that clarifies the concepts are ideals that may not be applicable in all desired locations because of streams, existing development patterns and topography.</p>
55.	<p>Page 9, Goal 3: there should be an Objective for Local Street Connectivity, similar to the current RTP.</p>	ODOT	<p>Added local street connectivity objective from current RTP.</p>
56.	<p>Page 11, Objective 5.2: this seems like an incomplete list of the types of natural environments to protect.</p>	ODOT	<p>Expanded list to include wildlife and fish habitat and corridors.</p>
57.	<p>Page 11, Objective 5.4: the top 4 measures listed do not measure or contribute to human health. Add a measure about walk and bike trips to school.</p>	ODOT and DEQ	<p>Added proposed measure.</p>

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
58.	Page 16, Transportation Management Concept: the text says that the first 5 Goals and Objectives also address System Management, but they do so only in a very incomplete way. There needs to be a specific Policy or Goal similar to the OHP Major Improvements Policy to state that before adding new capacity one must demonstrate that feasible TSM, TDM, and modal alternatives have been applied to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the Multi-Modal Corridor Capacity Concept. In addition, performance measures for TSM and TDM must be developed.	ODOT	Added new objectives specifically addressing system and demand management concepts. Performance measures will be developed during Phase 3.
59.	Equitable access and mobility should be brought under one category. Important and should be highlighted.	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	No change recommended to emphasize access and mobility as separate goals in Goals 3 and 4.
60.	Safety and Reliability could be put under one goal. Safety should address not only accidents/crash on roads but also safety at the bus/train stations, especially at very early and late hours Human health might be somewhat related to the safety goal.	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	Added language to expand security objective to get at personal safety.
61.	Under Goal 2's objectives (p. 8) Objective 2.2 states that providing a <i>"coordinated system that is barrier-free and serves the transportation needs for all people, including low income..."</i> is one of the objectives. Has there been any investigation that brings out the main transportation 'barriers' of the low income and minority population?	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	No change recommended. The series of stakeholder workshops and other documents RTP research identified barriers that will be addressed during Phase 3 as part of the system development and analysis.
62.	Effective people and goods movement (3.2): Corridor approach needs more discussion.	City of Gresham	Added language to more clearly describe the corridor approach in executive summary and system design concept discussion. The corridor approach is a system evaluation and monitoring tool and will use the system gap inventory and such performance measures, delay and volume-to-capacity to inform phasing of investments.
63.	Objective 4.2 appears to duplicate objectives 4.1 and 4.3	City of Beaverton	Deleted Objective 4.2.
64.	Consider percent of culverts that are fish friendly instead of number of culverts for Objective 5.2	City of Beaverton	Updated measure to include "percent."

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
65.	Objective 5.3 should be broadened to have emissions reductions as a goal.	City of Beaverton	Updated objective.
66.	Goal 3 – Add services to list of destinations.	Thomasina Gabrielle	Added reference to Goal 3.
67.	Goal 6, Objective 6.3 and Goal 8 – Add institutions to the list of participants.	Thomasina Gabrielle	Added references to Goal and objectives.
68.	There is no adequate measure for the transportation system's contribution to job creation and economic growth and competitiveness. Recommend a measure of economic benefits of transportation improvements (or conversely – economic costs of failing to make certain transportation improvements) along the lines of the "Cost of Congestion Study" to help prioritize transportation investments.	ODOT	Added a placeholder "Cost of congestion measurement" as potential performance measure that will be further defined in Phase 3. The draft policy framework also calls out the need develop measures for the economic value of freight and goods movement, 2040 centers and other priority land uses and bike tourism and other recreational uses.
69.	The plan should include a measure of the movement of people on the highways in both the peak and off-peak periods. The objective is to efficiently and effectively move people, goods, services, and information. A potential performance measure only relates to tons of freight movement off-peak. Performance measures should also include freight travel time, person travel time, and hours of peak and off-peak congestion on major facilities, and a measure to assess peak spreading.	FHWA	Agreed. Updated objectives under a new Goal 2 and Goal 4 address this in part. Additional freight and goods movement-related measures will be developed through the Regional Freight and Goods Movement TAC and Task force. These measures along with other measures to assess peak-hour spreading will be integrated into the policy framework during Phase 3.
70.	Measuring freight delays at regional freight corridors may miss the complete picture. Freight has to serve the region at the collector level to improve connectivity. There are also more sophisticated measures of reliability than daily truck delay that should be employed.	FHWA	Agreed. Additional freight and goods movement-related measures will be developed through the Regional Freight and Goods Movement TAC and Task Force. These measures will be integrated into the policy framework during Phase 3. The Task Force will also recommend a freight system plan to prioritize and protect critical freight links.
71.	The plan should provide convenient and safe parking spaces in sufficient numbers at reasonable prices.	FHWA	No change recommended. The RTP does not provide parking, local governments do through local comprehensive plans and land use decisions. Parking management is

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			appropriately included as an objective under Goal 1. Metro's 2005 Modal Targets study found that parking management is one of the most effective strategies for supporting transit-supportive development, increasing walking, bicycle and use of transit and minimizing impacts on the environment by using land more efficiently.
72.	Part of providing security is preventing crime on all modes of transportation, including transit.	FHWA	Agreed. Objective 5.3 has been revised to include a reference to crime specifically.
73.	There should be a goal of reducing transportation fatalities, injuries, and accidents for all modes. Look at frequency and exposure (travel) measures, not just per capita.	FHWA	Agreed. Goal 5 and updated Objective 5.1 addresses this comment.
74.	The plan should strive to improve the flow of mixed mode facilities for all vehicles. This includes the provision of bus bays for loading and unloading.	FHWA	Agreed. The draft policy framework is focused on improving the flow of mixed mode facilities for all modes of travel. TriMet and local governments already implement road design treatments such as bus bays in some locations, depending on a variety of factors. The RTP appropriately does not direct when those treatments should be applied.
75.	There should a measure of the cost per person trip in Goal 7.	FHWA	Agreed. This measure has been added to the list of possible performance measures. A final recommended set of measures will be developed and integrated into the policy framework during Phase 3.
76.	Goal 8 should measure congestion, safety, freight movement.	FHWA	Agreed that these are important measures; however, these types of measures are more appropriately included under Goal 2, Goal 4 and Goal 5.
77.	Add land use objective to transportation choices goal.	TriMet	Objective to be added.
78.	Page 5, Goal 3 – This should go a step further to include "livable streets" with complete pedestrian and bike features.	TriMet	No change recommended. This is described in street system concepts descriptions
79.	Page 8, Measures for Objective 2.1 - suggest adding: Percent of homes and parks within one-half mile access (via	TriMet	Added as recommended.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	neighborhood streets) of bike lanes or bikeways.		
80.	Page 8, Measures for Objective 2.2 – Suggest a revision to “Percent of seniors and people with disabilities within one-quarter <i>mile via continuous sidewalks/protected crosswalks</i> of regional transit service.”	TriMet	Added as recommended.
81.	Page 9, Measures for Objective 3.1 - Add words "off-peak" and consider both auto and transit.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
82.	Page 9, Goal 3 statement – As noted at the January 29 th JPACT retreat, need to be clearer about what (limited access) throughways really are. This looks like the RTP is calling for freeways to every industrial area. Consider separating industrial areas and freight intermodal facilities into separate objective that allows calling for truck-route access to throughways, rather than direct throughway access to all.	TriMet	Added language to clarify the type of access desired for these areas in the regional freight and goods movement concept. This will be further refined during Phase 3 during development of the critical freight corridors map and application of the system concepts to= identify transportation needs and support 2040 land uses..
83.	Page 9, Objective 3.2.4 - Consider two-tier 1/4 mile and 1/2 mile distances. 1/2 mile is still only a ten-minute walk - if there are sidewalks and still may have a level of acceptability in places where densities do not otherwise support a more dense transit network.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
84.	Page 9, Objective 3.2.5 - Consider adding access to rail as a potential measure, given the preferred performance of rail for long-distance freight movement. Also, how does small-truck freight (which may not need a "throughway") play into this objective?	TriMet	Added as recommended.
85.	Page 9, Objective 3.2.2 - While 1/2-mile access to transit is a widely considered standard, it may be inappropriate to call for regional transit service on all arterial streets. We must look at spacing and coverage instead. More frequent service on fewer streets that still allows walk access is far better than less frequent service on every arterial. This is probably mostly an issue only in eastside grid. Change "all" to "most."	TriMet	Added as recommended.
86.	Page 9, Objective 3.2.6 - Some measure of bikeway continuity should also be included.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
87.	Page 9, Objective 3.2.7 - Should also recognize the importance of <u>continuity</u> of the sidewalk network. Another measure should be intervals of safe (controlled) crossings of major arterials (1/2-mile minimum?).	TriMet	Added as recommended.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
88.	Page 10, Objective 3.10 - Continuity should be considered as well.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
89.	Page 10, Objective 4.1 - Add ped/bike injuries fatalities as a separate measure.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
90.	Page 10, Objective 4.2 - Specify time span for SPIS locations addressed (in last five years?).	TriMet	Added as recommended.
91.	Page 10, Objective 4.3 – Framework should include measures of personal safety and of national security / independence from foreign oil.	TriMet	Added placeholder measures to be further defined during Phase 3 as recommended. These objectives will be difficult to meaningfully measure.
92.	Page 11, Objective 5.1- Possible measure percentage growth in centers vs undifferentiated areas/urban fringe. Could also measure the percent of zoning capacity utilized by redevelopment – similar to some of the analysis used in the streetcar “Hovee” study.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
93.	Page 11, Objective 5.3 - Any way to track air quality-related health incidents (incidence of childhood asthma or cancers?)	TriMet	Added as suggested.
94.	The aspirational street design elements seem to make sense where a region has much land yet to develop, but not in a region where the network already substantially exists and functions a certain way based on the existing land use.	FHWA	Phase 3 of the RTP update will apply these aspirational design elements to the region to identify gaps for each mode of travel - including freight and motor vehicle system capacity needs/bottlenecks as well as gaps in the transit, bike, and pedestrian networks.
95.	There typically are challenges when an MPO uses a classification system that differs from the highway functional classification system utilized by FHWA and the States. Preferably the same system should be used, but if not, there should be clear translation to delineate consistently how one MPO classification falls into one in the FHWA/State system.	FHWA	Agreed. A table will be developed as part of the federal and state findings documenting how the RTP classification system matches up and is consistent with the highway functional classification system used by FHWA and ODOT.
96.	Describe how street design elements will apply to areas with existing development, streams and topography and new urban growth boundary expansion areas.	City of Tualatin , City of Portland, Clackamas County and TPAC workshop	Added language to better describe the design elements as being aspirational ideal and that application of them will need may not be appropriate in all areas due to existing development patterns, topography and other environmental considerations.
97.	Add cross-section illustrations of the street design elements.	TPAC workshop	Added illustrations.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
98.	Page 12 through 18: what is the legal meaning of the text on pages 12 through 18 and how do these concepts apply to the actions of transportation providers when they are not expressed in legally adopted policy language?	ODOT	Added language that entire chapter directs all transportation planning and project development activities in the Portland metropolitan region, and are therefore enforceable in local transportation system plans.
99.	All streets, including Collector and Local streets should comply with AASHTO design widths.	FHWA	AASHTO establishes guidelines not standards that should be considered by local governments in the design of local and collector streets. Metro’s Livable Streets handbooks are consistent with AASHTO guidelines.
100.	The transportation management chapter should acknowledge that this is a limited concept and that eventually added demand will necessitate system capacity improvements.	FHWA	Agreed. Added language that capacity will be needed.
101.	<p>Page 12, Throughways: We are not sure what it means that freeways and highways are described as “4 – 6 lanes”. Does that include auxiliary lanes? Does that mean there can never be more than 6 through travel lanes? This needs to be discussed more. Perhaps should be wider [in certain cases].</p> <p>Page 12 - For throughways, clarify number of lanes in each direction. This definition doesn't square with a desire to get these to every industrial area (see comment above for Objective 3.2.1). A suggestion would be to change or eliminate Objective 3.2.1.</p>	TPAC workshop, ODOT, TriMet, JPACT	Added language that describes the ideal throughway design as six <u>through</u> lanes. Auxilliary lanes would be in addition to the six lanes. The purpose of the policy is not to design every facility, but rather, to establish an expectation of what is typical in sizing the system. A process for exceptions to this typical design will be developed during Phase 3 and will be included in Chapter 7 of the plan.
102.	There is a new over-emphasis on efficiency, and it is potentially at the expense of roadway capacity and safety. All three need to be carefully considered in deciding what projects to include in the plan. For example, the working draft appears to limit “throughways” to 6 lanes. Demand in some circumstances may warrant more lanes and extra capacity. While the LOS policy needs to be re-examined, applying a systems network exclusively as a beginning tool suggests all existing capacities are adequate and the congestion issues can be addressed by improving efficiency.	Washington County	Added language to state that some capacity will be needed to achieve the regional street system concept. The systems concept is not intended to imply that all existing capacities are adequate or that congestion will only be addressed by improving efficiency. The policy framework does describe the need to implement management strategies to optimize performance of the system. The concept does not throw out LOS. The

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	This may not necessarily be correct. Throwing out LOS as a measure to use in a new policy seems premature.		framework recommends LOS be used as a diagnostic tool to monitor the system and inform project development activities.
103.	Capacity and Level Of Service measures are route and mode specific and cannot be applied collectively to the disparate highway types and modes in a corridor. Total person trip capacity does not reflect the actual capacity or congestion in the region. All trips are not transferable between/among modes. The available capacity in one mode may not reflect system conditions. LOS still serves an important purpose for roadway system performance and is a good indicator of current and projected service conditions of the facility.	FHWA	That is correct, and the reason why LOS is not proposed to be eliminated as suggested by this and other comments. LOS is retained as an indicator to monitor and evaluate current and future road system performance. Language has been added to the policy framework to more clearly describe this. The proposed person-trip capacity measure will be volume and capacity based, but applied to a series of interrelated corridors. This measure is recommended to complement LOS along with other measures. Additional work will be conducted to develop this new measure.
104.	Page 14 -15, High Capacity Transit: distinguish between BRT on separate lanes vs. shared lanes. This affects the speed and reliability of the transit, and is of great importance for the owners of the roadways to know the right-of-way implications of the “planned capacity, function, and level of service” of any transit service that the road is supposed to accommodate. The treatment of transit should be incorporated into the street design descriptions where applicable.	ODOT	New figure added to show the right-of-way implications of different types of transit services. Glossary definitions also updated.
105.	Street car should not be included in the Regional Transit Network- it is more appropriately part of the local transit network.	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	Added streetcar to list of local transit service types and expanded glossary definition to acknowledge role streetcar can serve as part of local and regional transit networks. Streetcar plays an important function in serving locally oriented circulation in higher density, mixed-use centers and leveraging 2040 centers development as a permanent transit feature. It is appropriately part of the regional transit network as a tool to connect higher-density mixed use centers as well as circulation within these centers that can also

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			result in significant ridership increases because of the quality of service provided.
106.	Consider concept of high-density transit where street car can be operated as a regional and local transit service.	Chris Smith	Added streetcar to list of local transit service types. See Comment #104.
107.	Consider that there is a two-dimensional framework that places the capacity of the mode on one axis and the ROW treatment on the other. Almost any mode can be placed in this 2-D framework.	TriMet	Added graphic displaying this framework.
108.	Figure 1 mentions 2-mile interchange spacing; the text refers to “no less than 1 mile.” Apart from this inconsistency, we need to distinguish between policy for new interchanges and policy that might drive us to remove an interchange.	ODOT	Updated language to state interchanges should be “no less than 2 miles apart.”
109.	Page 16, second paragraph of the Overview: The last sentence states that “managing the system ...is a necessary step before investing in further expansion of transportation infrastructure”. This is not always true, particularly for those areas where the existing infrastructure does not meet the regional street system concept and its connectivity measures or where new areas are brought into the UGB it is likely to be necessary to expand the transportation infrastructure, because the existing system does not serve those areas.	ODOT	Deleted clause at end of sentence.
110.	Clarify that bike gaps on regional streets could be addressed through projects off the regional street system.	TPAC workshop	Added language.
111.	Page 16, System Management Elements - It is not always true that lower speeds or traffic signals reduce capacity.	City of Beaverton	Deleted example.
112.	Page 18, Mode Choice: it would be good to include definitions of “mode choice” and “travel options” in the Glossary of Terms.	ODOT	Definitions to be added to the glossary.
113.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit system goals and priorities need more detail and clarity. • Should the RTP call out an “end state” for the regional transit concept? • What should the role of the streetcar be in regional transit service and 2040 Growth Concept? Role of streetcar is relatively new in region and has been focused in the City of Portland. Important to distinguish and clarify how to prioritize. 	TPAC workshop and City of Beaverton	Added new language describing more detail on the Regional Transit System Concept. See also comments #105 and #106. Triggers for transit service expansion will be defined during Phase 3.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What threshold should trigger expansion of high capacity transit and regional transit service in growing areas? The draft framework shifts focus from being Portland central city centric to be more multi-center centric, and needs to address reality of bringing services to regional centers that are not yet fully transit-supportive in terms of density and mix of uses. 		
114.	Freight component is unclear (although Freight Committee is working on this and a freight map)	City of Beaverton	Added new Regional Freight System Concept to more clearly describe the freight component. In addition, the Regional Freight and Goods movement planning effort has started to identify critical freight corridors to be included in the RTP. This map will be developed during Phase 3.
115.	There has been much discussion about pricing in the region over the past several years. However, Chapter 1 does not mention pricing. Some policy discussion early on in the RTP may be helpful.	TPAC workshop, ODOT and Washington County	Added language calling out value pricing as a system management tool that should be considered. Additional policy discussion of how and when this tool should be applied will occur during Phase 3.
116.	Clarify how parkways and expressways fit in.	JPACT	Both facility types are part of the principal arterial system (also called throughways in the policy framework). Expressways generally correspond to the "Highway" design concept in the policy framework. Parkway include regional multi-use trails and sometimes greenways as part of their design. Additional work will be completed in Phase 3 to describe strategies for achieving the design and operational objectives of these facilities.
117.	Page 12 - For both definitions of regional arterials, add a phrase at the end "at safe speeds" to clarify the "high traffic volumes" statement.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
118.	Page 13, Figure 1 - Add further caption: Idealized concept showing preferred spacing of facilities and illustration of multi-modal corridor for capacity analysis,	TriMet	Added as recommended.
119.	Page 13, Regional Street System Concept - Should be noted	TriMet	Added as recommended.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	somewhere that cross-arterials (the ability to move between different facilities in the corridor to respond to congestion) is essential.		
120.	Page 14, Figure 3 - Remove all cul-de-sacs, leaving those streets disconnected with larger blocks remaining.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
121.	Page 15 - Regional Transit Network, replace statement in parentheses with "all day and weekends when possible".	TriMet	Added as recommended.
122.	Page 15 – While streetcar can be used in a regional mode (Lake Oswego planning), it has thus far been used as a local circulator mode. You could list it in both places.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
123.	Page 15, Local Transit Network - Here would be a good place to mention the vital role of sidewalk connectivity and protected crosswalks.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
124.	Page 16 -Overview, 2 nd paragraph – Stocking buying analogy is not appropriate.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
125.	Page 17- 2nd paragraph under Application in the Portland metro region, last sentence - Add word in all caps as follows: "This simple approach to system management does not require any ADVANCED technology..."	TriMet	Added as recommended.
126.	Page 17- At the end of the sentence under "Ongoing" add "...as TriMet currently does."	TriMet	Added as recommended.
127.	Page 18, Choice of route and timing – You might insert in here that these systems can also help select among modes – for example, the latest version of Google Maps compares transit and auto travel times AND cost.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
128.	Page 20, Objective 7.2 - Need more explanation about the "relative cost comparison for roadway and transit operations and maintenance". What's the goal and do we find ourselves comparing costs between modes?	TriMet	No change recommended. The measure is intended to give a rough cost approximation of the cost to maintain and operate the proposed road and transit systems, not to compare between modes.
129.	Important to consider intersection treatments and signalization techniques (e.g., the people factor).	City of Beaverton and Clackamas County	Language to be added to version 3.0 draft on this.
130.	Unclear whether regional mobility concept proposes throughways every two miles.	Washington County	Text will be updated to better describe the primary purpose of this concept – as an evaluation tool – not a throughway spacing design tool. Regional mobility concept and 2-mile example shown in Figure 2 is

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			intended to show that throughways interact with parallel arterials and evaluation of these important corridors should include those parallel routes. The policy framework and system concepts do not recommend a spacing standard for throughways. TPAC will help define the regional mobility corridors to be evaluated in Phase 3 and monitored between RTP updates.
131.	Corridors term is used throughout document in different ways. Need to define more clearly.	City of Wilsonville	Added as recommended.
132.	Page 22, Glossary, Local bus, second sentence - Add: "... as often as every 30 minutes on weekdays AND MAY BE MORE FREQUENT DURING HOURS OF PEAK DEMAND."	TriMet	Added as recommended.
133.	Page 23, Glossary, Park-and-ride - While most park & rides have some attention given to bike and pedestrian connections, the nexus is not very relevant. Those facilities are more associated with major bus stops and transit centers, which tend to be in pedestrian-oriented environments. Also, be more direct, add sentence: "Avoid large park-and-rides in centers where possible, or provide for shared-use or conversion to local uses over time."	TriMet	Added as recommended.
134.	Page 23, Glossary - Passenger intermodal facilities: Should Oregon City Amtrak station be added?	TriMet	Added to list.
135.	Page 24, Glossary - Passenger rail, delete "up to 79 miles per hour". We should hope for more.	TriMet	Added as recommended.
136.	Page 24, Glossary, Streetcar - Add new 2nd sentences: "Streetcar service often provide local circulator service and also serves as a potent incentive for denser development in centers"	TriMet	Added as recommended.
137.	Page 24, Glossary, Streetcar - Add new 2nd sentences: "Streetcar service often provide local circulator service and also serves as a potent incentive for denser development in centers"	TriMet	Added as recommended.
138.	There needs to be a measure that assures the system will in fact work, that is useful for making investments, operations and design decisions, and that works when applied to development review decisions. Metro must demonstrate that	ODOT	System analysis phase will include creation of a transportation needs inventory, development of performance measures and testing the concepts to evaluate

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p>the connectivity or street system design and multimodal corridor capacity concepts and their proposed performance measures together will ensure that the system will function adequately to meet identified state and regional transportation needs.</p>		<p>effectiveness. Refinements will be made as needed to address the findings of the analysis.</p>
139.	<p>Clarify how the proposed concepts and alternative performance measures will fit into/address the TPR and OTP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how the proposed alternative performance measures will apply to plan amendment and development review proposals consistent with 060 of the TPR: • What are the implications of RTP adoption on local TSPs (e.g, timing)? Local jurisdictions may be caught in the middle while State and Metro are trying new ideas and locals still pushing local agenda. Important to keep known ahead of time, don't want to get stuck in double compliance, have RTP as compliance manual, approved by state. 	<p>TPAC workshop, JPACT, MTAC, Port of Portland and ODOT</p>	<p>Additional legal research and consultation with the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Land Conservation and Development Commission will be conducted during Phase 3 as part of the system evaluation and development of findings that document compliance with state requirements. Under the TPR, local governments will have one year from adoption of the RTP by ordinance to update local transportation system plans.</p>
140.	<p>The Draft RTP chapter 1 does not incorporate the notion of identifying and improving bottlenecks as a way to prioritize investments and to ensure freight mobility and reliability consistent with the OTP and FHWA initiatives.</p>	<p>ODOT and Port of Portland</p>	<p>A potential action has been added to call out the need to identify and address bottlenecks in the system. If the bottleneck is the result of a gap in system capacity under the proposed policy framework, then these gaps are appropriately addressed through capacity investments. If the bottleneck is on a facility that already meets the aspirational capacity defined in the system concept, then the policy framework calls for addressing bottlenecks in the context of the effects on the broader corridor rather than only focusing on spots of congestion. This would be accomplished through completing other system connectivity gaps and implementation of TSM and TDM strategies in the broader corridor (e.g., regional mobility corridor concept). Addressing</p>

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			bottlenecks will be part of strategies (including the identification of gaps and corresponding projects) for how to achieve the goals and measurable objectives identified in the policy framework. The strategies will be refined during Phase 3.
141.	Under the Governance section, we need to add an objective to distinguish what part of the system is primarily a "regional" responsibility and what part is primarily a "local" responsibility. For example, where do bike lanes and sidewalks along roads fall? What about collector streets, community streets or community boulevards?	Washington County	This will be addressed in action strategies during Phase 3 of the RTP.
142.	Need more specifics on outcomes measures; measures need to match up with goals and objectives. Do we have reliable data upon which to base performance measures? Who is responsible for collecting? Performance measures need to be thoughtful without creating a bureaucracy of measurement.	Clackamas County, City of Beaverton and DEQ	Specific measures will be developed during Phase 3 that better match the goals and objectives. In some cases, reliable data may not be available. Data collection- related strategies, and responsibilities for different data needs, will be identified in those cases.
143.	Describe how this approach will result in bike and pedestrian gaps being identified and addressed.	TPAC workshop	The policy framework defines the roads of regional significance as being throughways and arterials that are also complemented by a network of off-street regional multi-use trails with a transportation function. A map will be developed showing all of these together - by classification. By inference, the arterials would also be the bicycle and pedestrian routes of regional significance. The map would also identify pedestrian districts (which correspond to the 2040 centers). Bike and pedestrian network gaps will be identified during Phase 3 as part of creating a needs inventory through application of the design concepts on the existing transportation system. The regional sidewalk inventory and Bike There map will be used to inform this gap analysis. ODOT, local governments and

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			special districts will be asked to identify projects to address these and other identified gaps. Future RTPs would monitor completion of these system gaps.
144.	<p>What role should scenarios play and how can they be designed to inform RTP framework?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will RTP scenarios inform investments that will achieve ~2040 vision for centers and other 2040 land uses? • Concepts needs to be evaluated to demonstrate they will work and if they do not work, we will need to develop alternative concept that will. 	TPAC workshop	This will be addressed during Phase 3 as part of system development and analysis.
145.	<p>What are the implications of RTP framework on New Look and future urban growth boundary planning processes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications of land use decisions being made today (in new and existing areas) and future UGB expansions if we are limited to the FC system of projects (e.g., “ripple effect” on neighbor cities and “greater region”)? • How do you deal with the land use of the future that is not currently covered by the regional transportation system? • What if 2040 hierarchy changes as a result of New Look? 	TPAC workshop, City of Portland and Port of Portland	The draft policy framework uses the current 2040 design types. The 2040 hierarchy, adopted in the 2004 RTP, has been updated to further prioritize 2040 land use areas for purposes of regional transportation investments to address comments that the draft framework did not adequately establish priorities. The New Look process will also consider new 2040 design types and investment priorities. To the extent possible, policy recommendations from the New Look will be incorporated into the RTP during Phase 3. New Look recommendations that cannot be incorporated into the updated RTP due to the aggressive timeline will be reconciled through follow-on RTP amendments, after the RTP update is complete. The RTP is updated every four years. A footnote has been added to the 2040 Growth Concept discussion to acknowledge this.
146.	<p>How does the “built system” approach fit with our fiscal constraint emphasis?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does a fiscally constrained RTP shift the funding burden to local governments? • How to balance fiscal constraint requirement with 	TPAC workshop	This will be addressed as part of the RTP finance policy discussions and development of finance strategies during Phase 3.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p>aspirations/needs for achieving 2040 that will exceed FC revenue forecast—can aspirations be tied to FC system if region commits to raising additional money?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the implications of land use decisions being made today (in new and existing areas) if we are limited to the FC system of projects (e.g., “ripple effect” on local governments for raising/re-tooling financing mechanisms in region). 		
147.	Does the multi-modal corridor concept “grandfather” current highway or transit projects?	TPAC workshop	No projects are recommended to be grandfathered into the RTP. Many current RTP projects will meet the updated goals and objectives and address the system gaps to be inventoried during Phase 3.
148.	Concern regarding the involvement of community groups that represent the traditionally under-represented populations including ethnic minority and low-income individuals and families. It was not clear from the draft or the discussions held till date about the draft, how much the community groups participated in this process.	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	<p>The public participation plan was approved by JPACT and the Metro Council as part of the RTP update work program in June 2006. TPAC reviewed and discussed the work program prior to that approval. Traditional “open houses” in the past have not attracted these voices to the discussion. We elected to conduct two stakeholder workshops with people representing minority and low-income persons in different parts of the region, one of which was conducted in Spanish at Centro Cultural in Cornelius. A third workshop was conducted with people who are interested in the connection between transportation and health—both disease prevention and health promotion — including elderly and people with disabilities. A fourth workshop was held with representatives from community-based organizations that are members of the Coalition for a Livable Future. A fifth workshop was held with private business, education and other institutional service providers and economic-</p>

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			<p>development interests.</p> <p>Private business and economic development organizations were also included in forum held early in the scoping phase of the RTP update to gather input on what the update should address. A second forum was held in June that included not only these private business interests, but also a variety of community groups and advocacy organizations, as well as any interested individuals who wanted to attend.</p>
149.	Concern about the participation of employers (non-government), professional associations and businesses in setting the main goals and objectives.	Sreya Sarkar, TPAC	<p>In addition to the response to #148, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force and a separate technical advisory committee have been established, meeting regularly on this topic. These committees include significant employers and business representation.</p> <p>Recommendations from these committees will be forwarded to the RTP update process, including refinements to the draft policy framework.</p>
150.	Connection between VMT and equitable access unclear. How does plan relate to portions of the population that have choices versus those that have to use alternative?	JPACT retreat	See also recommendation # 33. The plan goals and objectives, particularly Goal 3 and related objectives, emphasize providing affordable and reliable choices to all residents of the region. Providing choices, compact urban form and services that inform residents about their choices can help reduce drive alone trips and VMT.
151.	Address region's role in accommodating through trips on its highways.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Language has been added.
152.	Address the need for more freeway capacity to address congestion.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement	Language has been added strategic capacity investments will be needed to

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
		Task Force	address congestion and other desired outcomes for the transportation system.
153.	Address peak hour reliability not just off-peak reliability.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Expanded freight reliability objective to also evaluate peak hour reliability.
154.	System design concept is supply-based for sizing. Need to also consider demand to avoid under- or over-sizing the road network. Need to acknowledge exceptions where more intensive land uses are planned. Policy should state what happens in places where supply sizing won't work. What is the unit of measure for system performance?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Language has been added that a process for exceptions to the system design/sizing of facilities will be identified in Chapter 7 of the plan during phase 3. Multiple measures are proposed to assess system performance and demand, including travel time variability, levels of congestion (e.g., volume/capacity) and delay, travel speeds, mode shares, vehicle miles traveled per capita and transit ridership.
155.	Not clear on how LOS will be used.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	LOS is not proposed to be eliminated as suggested other comments. LOS is retained as an indicator to monitor and evaluate current and future road system performance. Language has been added to the policy framework to more clearly describe this. The proposed person-trip capacity measure will be volume and capacity based, but applied to a series of interrelated corridors. This measure is recommended to complement LOS along with other measures. Additional work will be conducted to develop this new measure.
156.	What happens to the functional classification maps?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force and City of Portland	The functional classification maps will be consolidated into two functional classification maps – a motor vehicle system map and a transit system map. These maps will use the existing RTP functional classifications as a starting point and update them as part of applying the System Design Concepts. They are proposed to be included in Chapter 3 of the

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			<p>RTP as part of the needs assessment. A third map of critical freight routes will also be developed as part of applying the Regional Freight Network Concept to assist in prioritizing freight investments. For purposes of the RTP, the regional bicycle and pedestrian networks correspond to the arterial street network and identified regional multi-use trails with a transportation function. The regional pedestrian network also includes infrastructure in pedestrian districts that correspond to 2040 centers and station communities. Bikeway gaps on arterials may be addressed through bikeways or bicycle boulevards off the regional system on parallel facilities when right-of-way constraints exist or when the regional arterial system does not meet arterial spacing standards.</p>
157.	How does the transportation system concept related to the 2040 land uses?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Application of the system concepts will respond to varying needs of 2040 land uses.
158.	How will system design concept be used to make decisions about investments?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	<p>Transportation needs will be identified where gaps are identified when the system design concept is applied for all modes of travel during Phase 3. This will include the identification of bottlenecks, missing sidewalk and bikeway connections, needed capacity and new street connections. Those investments that achieve multiple goals (e.g., safety, connectivity, reliable people/goods movement, clean air) will be identified as the priority for investments..</p>
159.	Address economic competitiveness. Give priority to corridors that benefit the economy.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Language has been added to better address economic competitiveness, expanding notion beyond freight mobility to also include worker access to jobs, a healthy

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			environment and quality of life.
160.	Talking about (congestion) pricing muddies the water. Figure out how to make the system design concept function without making pricing an element. Separate issue.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Language has been added to state that pricing is not a widely accepted tool at this time. However, the draft policy framework takes a system perspective that requires the use of all the tools in the “tool box” to achieve the goals and objectives of the plan. Pricing and other system and demand management tools will need to be used in combination with the system design concept to effectively optimize the regional transportation system for people and goods movement as well as to meet other plan goals. The extent to which pricing should be considered and/or applied in this region will be the subject of future policy discussion by JPACT and the Metro Council during Phase 3.
161.	Will implementation of the system design concept recapture some of the lost capacity on arterials the converted to boulevard design?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	A potential action has been added to specifically address freight needs during transportation studies. Refinements to the potential actions will be made during Phase 3. As proposed, the policy framework would be applied in future transportation studies – and would call for applying the system design and management concepts as appropriate. Boulevards are an important design component in 2040 centers and mixed-use areas. The Regional Freight and Goods Movement Plan will also make recommendations for how to better address freight movement and freight loading needs as part of boulevard designs in these areas. These recommendations will be incorporated into future updates of the Livable Streets handbooks.
162.	Too multimodal on basic street design. Not every street can	Regional Freight and	Multi-modal design is a center piece of the

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	be everything to everybody.	Goods Movement Task Force	system approach described in the policy framework language. Language has been added to clarify the emphasis of different design elements changes to respond to the function of the facility and the land uses it is intended to serve.
163.	How do does the system design concept address to shorter-term marketplace changes? Need adaptability. Example railroads use off-peak scheduling and peak hour pricing to address capacity issues.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	These are potential actions that would be identified under the system management concepts.
164.	How can the marketplace be connected to the ongoing monitoring of the system? How do we account for economic change?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	The RTP is updated every four years. Performance monitoring will occur as part of the periodic updates. Demographic, economic and financial trends will be re-evaluated through future updates to ensure the plan is responsive and adaptive to changing conditions.
165.	Set an upper threshold on specific corridors as a backstop to prevent failure – missing investment criteria.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Investment/project prioritization criteria will be developed during Phase 3 to implement the Goals and Objectives identified in the draft policy framework.
166.	Optimization models used in private sector a tool to compare efficiency benefits of one route to another.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	This comment will be addressed to the extent possible during Phase 3 as part of development of measures to analyze system performance. Current analysis tools limit our ability to evaluate efficiency benefits of one route versus another.
167.	How do you prioritize corridors? What are criteria for determining which corridors are most critical.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Corridors and investments will be prioritized based on the Goals and Objectives and supporting functional classification maps and critical freight route map to be defined during Phase 3.
168.	Separate analysis of corridors moving people from corridors moving freight.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	No change recommended. It is important to look analyze the corridors for all modes of travel to the extent possible because reducing the number of people trips on

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			critical freight corridors will be part of the overall strategy to manage congestion and improve freight reliability.
169.	Tools need to identify bottlenecks based on economic impact.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Identification of bottlenecks for freight movement will be conducted in Phase 3. Performance measures will be refined during Phase 3 and will try to assess economic impact at a system level, not on a project by project basis.
170.	What is the backstop if the system is not working?	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	The policy framework calls for aggressive management of the system, strategic investments that provide new and expanded infrastructure and services that support all modes of travel, and raising new revenue to fund needed investments. The RTP is updated every four years to allow for future course corrections to respond to findings from the system monitoring that will occur in between updates.
171.	Reconcile data/policy conclusions with existing body of work, such as surveys.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	The draft policy framework responds to the RTP background research on the transportation system, stakeholder workshops and public opinion research.
172.	There may be merits in adding discussion on the following: a definition of "freight"; integration of RTP with existing city/county RTPs; education section; existing data and reports and their relationship to each other, (e.g., explain discrepancies in recent surveys); identification of policy areas to be targeted for review/discussion; for example, at the retreat, the JPACT Chair mentioned existing data predicts substantial increases in truck traffic and noted perhaps a policy to consider may be getting the freight onto rail. This would appear to be a major policy shift; absent supporting or rejecting merits of the policy, it may be one of many policy calls that simply need to be addressed. Other such policies may be limits on truck size distinction between light and heavy freight, etc. The suggestion was not	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	Possible "policy" actions have been identified for each goal and objective in the draft policy framework. These potential actions and strategies are intended to serve as a starting point will be further refined and addressed during Phase 3 and post-RTP adoption implementation activities.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	necessarily to identify all these policies at this time (this will be part of the process of writing the RTP), rather to incorporate a section discussing policies, which are different than goals, objectives, and measurement tools.		
173.	Include a <u>½ mile grid network of low-traffic routes prioritized for non-auto travel</u> in Goal 4.2.6 and 4.2.8 and revise p. 12, 26-27 to reflect these changes.	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	The current RTP local connectivity requirements will be refined during Phase 3 to better integrate the notion of providing low-traffic routes for walking and bicycling. Connectivity of the street system is critical because the arterial, collector and local street networks provide the backbone for bicycle and pedestrian travel in the region. The RTP has a responsibility to provide continuous bicycle and pedestrian connections on all arterials where possible, recognizing there may be locations in the region where existing development, natural features or other circumstances may cause right-of-way constraints. This, in turn, requires designing the transportation system to have a well-connected network of four-lane arterials, where possible, that are supported by a well-connected network of collector and local streets that are a local responsibility, not an RTP responsibility.
174.	Metro currently recommends a Community Collector every mile. We are concerned that these Collector routes will still have travel volumes and speeds that exceed that optimal level for bicyclists; every other ½ mile the Collector is an Arterial or Thoroughfare, these classifications will not adequately serve the larger majority of <i>potential</i> cyclists. Therefore, <u>we recommend that the ½ mile network be identified as “new lines” on the local street network maps that fall in between the Arterials and Collectors.</u> The Regional Trail System can be overlaid on and be part of this network.	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Collectors are recommended every half-mile. The current RTP local connectivity requirements will be refined during Phase 3 to better integrate the notion of providing low-traffic routes for walking and bicycling. The draft policy framework calls for arterials spaced one mile apart (not collectors) where possible, that are supported by a well-connected network of collector and local streets that are a local responsibility, not an RTP responsibility. Bikeway gaps on arterials may be addressed through bikeways or bicycle boulevards off the

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
			regional system on parallel facilities when right-of-way constraints exist or when the regional arterial system does not meet arterial spacing standards.
175.	Metro create a new design standard for low-traffic bicycle boulevards , p.31.	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	A definition of bicycle boulevard has been added to the glossary, but development of design standards for bicycle boulevards is beyond the scope of the current RTP update.
176.	<u>new priority pedestrian network should be identified for centers and main streets.</u> We believe that pedestrian access in the Centers is critical to Metro's 2040 Plan. The RTP must include policy statements about pedestrian circulation in and to the centers. Goal 4.2.7 and 4.2.8, p. 26-27 should be revised to reflect these changes.	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Language has been added to clarify what is considered part of the Regional Pedestrian Network and potential actions have also been developed to address this. For purposes of the RTP, the regional pedestrian network corresponds to the arterial street network, identified regional multi-use trails with a transportation function, and infrastructure in pedestrian districts (e.g., wider sidewalks, pedestrian-scale lighting, benches, and other features). The pedestrian districts correspond to 2040 centers and station communities.
177.	<i>Executive Summary</i> It should be stated that the Portland Metro region has one of the best performing transportation systems in the nation.	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Revised as recommended.
178.	<i>Framing the Crossroads</i> The impact of congestion per Metro's report should be more accurately stated as the following: "in 2025 the impact of congestion will increase freight costs by \$422 million and \$422 million in worker productivity will be lost due to increased in travel time."	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Revised as recommended.
179.	<i>Goal 2 Sustainable Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity</i> This goal as written only relates to freight movement and transportation access, but does not discuss the impact of other transportation investments on the economy and job creation and retention, especially related to Return on	Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Added language to describe and acknowledge, collectively, freight reliability, protecting the environment and providing access to centers and industry are important for retaining the region's economic competitiveness. The framework also now

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	Investment of transportation investments in centers. We strongly urge Metro to add objectives that ties the 2040 Plan, investments in Centers, back to economic competitiveness.		includes an action to try to develop a method to measure this.
180.	Timing/coordination with the New Look Is the RTP getting out in front of the New Look? Should this RTP be an interim update without major changes until the New Look catches up?	City of Portland	The RTP is updated every four years. Policy direction from the New Look will be incorporated in the RTP to the extent possible and through future updates to the RTP. A footnote has been added to the 2040 Growth Concept discussion to acknowledge this.
181.	Interchanges and Bridges The RTP needs to establish regional policies (and hence agreement with ODOT) about interchanges and bridges. These are both major facilities that provide important regional services, but may have substantial local impacts. Should there be a regional approach or model language regarding IAMPs? Are there enough bridges in our regional plan? How do we prioritize, design and pay for them?	City of Portland	Added language in potential actions section of Goal 4 and Goal 8 to call this out. More discussion of this will occur during Phase 3 to better address this issue in the policy framework, needs assessment and prioritization criteria.
182.	What are the implications of dropping pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle maps? Especially for local jurisdictions related to inter-jurisdictional coordination. For example, resolving street purpose and classification differences between adjoining jurisdictions where a regional street connects between both. There could also be funding implications in terms of how competing pedestrian projects are scored for MTIP. Why does transit, freight and trails warrant separate maps? The transit system map continues to focus on vehicle type rather than function. What do the bike and pedestrian communities have to say about such changes? How does the Federal Functional Classifications interface with the RTP if the RTP does not have functional maps?	City of Portland	The motor vehicle, freight and transit maps will be developed in Phase 3 and are proposed to be included in Chapter 3 as part of the needs assessment. For purposes of the RTP, the regional bike and pedestrian network will be the arterial system, pedestrian districts that correspond to the 2040 centers and station communities designations and regional multi-use trails with a transportation function. A new table has been added that identifies network function for each regional street type and new text has been added to better describe the function of different transit elements.
183.	If Creating Livable Streets will be the “standard” for street design and function, the documents need to have more	City of Portland	The urban road design types are proposed to be eliminated to simplify the design

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	weight than guidelines and need to be updated to acknowledge situations where ROW is highly constrained. Creating Livable Streets may also overlook the special needs of freight and functional realities of some streets now classified as Urban Roads. (What happened to Urban Roads?)		concepts. The Regional Freight and Goods Movement Plan will identify refinements to the Livable Streets handbooks to better address freight needs. The handbooks are still appropriately guidelines and do acknowledge situations where ROW is constrained, providing guidance on what elements to emphasize depending on the function and land use a street is intended to serve.
184.	Concerns with lack of details in terms of developing criteria and performance measures as surrogates for LOS, connectivity, bottlenecks, recognizing the importance of freight movement, completing a regional system network, etc.	City of Portland	Criteria and performance measures will be developed during Phase 3. The recommended draft includes some potential actions to help guide this work.
185.	Jurisdictions want to know the implications of new policy language before signing on to it. For example, is Objective 1.3, Parking Management going to result in new parking mandates or is it a continuation of previous requirements for minimum and maximum parking ratios?	City of Portland	This objective has been moved to “potential actions” under Goal 1, Objective 1.1 and is intended to be in addition to current Title 2 parking requirements. In 2005, the 2040 Modal Targets study recommended expanding parking management strategies to include more active management of parking to help the region achieve the modal targets for 2040 centers.
186.	Highest Priority – there are over 10 objectives that are portrayed as “highest priority”. Not only is this confusing, if true, but doesn’t actually help - what <u>is</u> the highest priority if there is one? How does the “highest priority” relate to funding? Fiscal Stewardship – highest priorities are competing.	City of Portland	The objectives establish investment priorities within each goal. The highest priority investments would be those that are cost-effective and meet multiple goals. Language has been added to describe this better.
187.	Too much use of jargon phrases. For example, “business access to the workforce” – does this imply that the jobs go to the workers? “regional mobility corridor” – this appears to be a key point in the new RTP, but there is no definition.	City of Portland	Definitions have been added to recommended draft and “jargon” has been eliminated to the extent possible.
188.	Transit Concept – Not clear on how the transit network is proposed to change. Figures 12 and 13 are new, but not helpful in clarifying. There is a need to understand if there is	City of Portland	This discussion has been expanded to better describe what is envisioned and how

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p>a fundamental shift in transit service and coverage. Concept does not fit with realities of TriMet service. For example, when new LRT is added, bus service is limited or dropped. Arterials in outer SE and parts of SW do not have service or service that does not meet the concept. How does the new concept change this practice?</p> <p>Regional Transit Concept- Seems scattered throughout the document and doesn't really explain the concept. How is it different from the current policy/concept? The document talks about vehicle types more than service quality and coverage. How do we build on the existing system? How do we serve ever increasing densities in centers while serving under served populations? Should reliance on park and rides continue? Is the "local transit" discussion the same as objective 4.2.4.? If so, why do they have different names?</p> <p>If streetcar is a viable part of the Regional Transit Network and the "local transit network" then Figure 13 is incorrect and the streetcar bubble should be an elongated bubble along with the "fully dedicated guideway/priority treatment in mixed traffic".</p>		<p>it is proposed to be implemented. The concept proposed to use the current RTP transit elements but integrates them in a way to better serve growing transit service demand that is not always destined for the Portland central city. Potential actions have also been identified to describe some of the land use and service provision coordination that will be needed.</p>
189.	<p>Arterial Spacing – A hierarchy of streets and connective goals are good, but it appears that an arbitrary spacing of arterials is difficult if not impossible to achieve. How would this be implemented? How does it carry out 2040? Shouldn't there be a tighter grid of streets in high dense parts of the region? (That carry a denser network of transit?) And less dense grid of arterials in low-density areas?</p>	City of Portland	<p>This is true for higher density parts of region as well as lower density to better support travel by all modes of travel and help manage congestion on the region's throughway system by spreading out traffic. Current RTP connectivity requirements call for a more highly connected local and collector street network in new residential and mix-used areas.</p>
190.	<p>Clarify pedestrian and bicycle networks – where are the maps? Difficult to comment and recommend approval with placeholders. 4.2.6 says bikeways on all regional streets, surely this is not intended to relate to limited access throughways (I-5, etc.). Same goes for pedestrian facilities – are throughways part of the regional system or not? Is there a map of the regional ped and bike system?</p>	City of Portland	<p>Language has been updated to call for bikeways and pedestrian facilities on all arterials, noting that in some cases the bikeway may be provided on a parallel route due to right-of-way or other constraints.</p>

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
191.	5.5 System Management – given the nature of the objective – shouldn't the system management concepts be described here rather than referenced to a discussion 14 pages later?	City of Portland	System management has been moved to earlier section with other "system concepts."
192.	5.5 System Security - How does Metro propose to reduce vulnerability to crime? And what "measure of personal safety" would capture this? Is crime an issue on the regional system? Preparation and response to natural disasters and other emergencies are legitimate goals.	City of Portland	Actions to reduce vulnerability to crime have been added. These will be further refined in Phase 3.
193.	6.1 Natural Environments. More clarity is needed as this objective is poorly worded and doesn't reflect current knowledge about air quality, eg benzene.	City of Portland	Objective 6.1 has been re-worded as proposed. Air quality is captured in Objective 6.2.
194.	The discussion of mobility and access seems to have terms confused. The glossary has definitions that seem much clearer. Spacing of regional and community arterials speaks more to mobility than accessibility. Where is the discussion of the regional street concepts that this section is titled for?	City of Portland	This section has been revised to clarify the distinction and now includes a description of functional classifications and their relationship to street design.
195.	Figure 1 and discussion of mobility and accessibility not consistent– are "4-lane arterials" community or regional collectors? Please use same definitions and language/labels in text as on figures. Unclear what type of streets text is referring to.	City of Portland	This section has been revised to clarify that four lane arterials correspond to a "major arterial" functional classification. Collectors are no longer considered part of the regional system and are referenced to call out their importance to supporting the arterial system.
196.	Appears that a local street and a collector are treated the same in term of connectivity –true? (Figure 3?) Define local connections.	City of Portland	Definitions have been added. Their connectivity spacing requirements are the same.
197.	Also Figure 1 – the note at the bottom related to "respond to congestion" appears to be the "replacement" for LOS? If so, why is it a note on a figure that is confusing? Please put the arterial connections and response to congestion up front and center if that is the replacement for LOS.	City of Portland	Level-of-service is not proposed to go away, but instead be used as a tool to evaluate and monitor system performance.
198.	What are "complementary facilities" – names/labels in figures should be same as in text.	City of Portland	Complementary facilities provide a supportive role in achieving a well-connected, multi-modal system.
199.	Figure 2 – does not illustrate anything about regional mobility. What do the small boxes represent? Modal types? Vehicle types? Needs a legend to clarify. Also should	City of Portland	This figure is for illustrative purposes only to show what elements of regional mobility

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	Regional be next to throughway?		corridors should be monitored and evaluated from a system perspective to ensure the regional mobility objective is being met. Clarifying language has been added. A better illustration will be developed and actual corridors to be monitored identified during Phase 3.
200.	Figure 3 – Doesn't show much and there are a lot of gaps in connectivity. Has the bike/ped connectivity at smaller intervals been dropped?	City of Portland	This figure is for illustrative purposes only and reflects that connectivity requirements may not be met in all cases due to existing development, streams, topography or other constraints. Current RTP requirements for bike and pedestrian connectivity at smaller intervals will be retained. Better illustrations will be developed during Phase 3.
201.	Figure 12 – Doesn't show connections between centers as described in 4.2.3 and 4.2.4. If it's supposed to show transit types, why doesn't it show the community/local system? Is it local or community – conflicting graphics.	City of Portland	This figure is intended to show the regional transit system which includes the high capacity transit network and regional transit network. The community transit network functions in a similar, supporting role that the local/collector street system serves.
202.	Parking Management – It should be key tool in managing congestion and was an important part of our land use and transportation goals in UGMFP. Now seems to be a mere placeholder – what is status?	City of Portland	A definition has been added to describe its role and it is now included in the potential actions under Goal 1, Objective 1.1 and is intended to be in addition to current Title 2 parking requirements. In 2005, the 2040 Modal Targets study recommended expanding parking management strategies to include more active management of parking to help the region achieve the modal targets for 2040 centers. No change to the current Title 2 of the urban growth management functional plan is proposed at this time, but may be recommended during Phase 3 of the RTP update or through the New Look process.
203.	Value Pricing – Should be bolder here. Look to ODOT and	City of Portland	This will become an important policy

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	OTP as model.		discussion during Phase 3. Application of this has been added to potential actions to be considered.
204.	Governance. Is there a better term for this that doesn't sound so paternalistic? Needs to reflect partnership between Metro and local jurisdictions.	City of Portland	No change recommended. Governance is broader than cooperation between Metro and local jurisdictions. The concept includes effective public involvement, ensuring transportation decisions do not disproportionately impact different communities and being stewards of the public's money. This has been clarified in the recommended draft.
205.	2040 Regional NON SOV – this used to a key performance measure for the RTP that local jurisdictions were required to adopt into their comp plans. Is that no longer required? Replaced by performance measure for Objective 6.3?	City of Portland	Non-SOV modal targets are still a key performance measure for the RTP and are referenced in Objective 3.1. The objective has been revised to more specifically describe that as the desired outcome.
206.	<p>Page 10. The second paragraph under 2040 Growth Concept describes how 2040 design types areas can be grouped into a hierarchy and that certain design types (such a regional centers) "provide the best opportunity for public policy to shape development and are, therefore, the best candidates for immediate transportation system investments. The second highest investment priority land uses for transportation investments are the secondary land use components." This seems to suggest system investments are limited to projects within the design type area. A more outcome based approach would be to determine what the region wants to achieve and how transportation investments will help that happen.</p> <p>A project that happens to be located in an inner neighborhood but provides a critical link to the regional center from an industrial district or town center may be more likely to produce the desired outcome for the regional center than a project within the regional center would have. It is important to realize that the regional centers have a wide</p>	City of Gresham	Current analysis tools limit our ability to evaluate the full impact of smaller investments (e.g., sidewalk or local street connections) in supporting growth in regional centers. This RTP update is also trying to provide a more clear distinction between what is of regional significance and what should be more of a local responsibility when making transportation investments. This comment will be considered during the development of the project solicitation and prioritization process during Phase 3.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	market area and that the success of the regional centers depends on access to the regional center from the surrounding market area.		
207.	Page 11. Table 1. We would suggest that Industrial Areas (there are no "local" industrial areas in the Functional Plan) are as important to the region's ability to provide employment, wages and added economic value as RSIA. For example, the Title 11 compliance report for the Springwater UGB expansion areas found that the Springwater industrial lands as opposed to the RSIA lands provide about 1.5 more jobs per acre. In Springwater the industrial district is targeted to industrial and related employment opportunities that take place in office buildings. These will include knowledge-based industries and research and development facilities. These will provide high value and complement the much larger RSIA in Springwater. We would suggest moving Industrial lands in the same hierarchy as RSIA.	City of Gresham, JPACT, MTAC, MPAC and TPAC	Revised as recommended. Regionally significant and local industrial areas have been grouped together in the Primary Land Use Components category.
208.	Page 11. 2040 Fundamentals. There is no description in this chapter about the UGB expansion areas. The region has enacted significant expansions since 1998 that are expected to accommodate many of those 1 million new people that are projected to come to the region. The RTP discussion about how to create a regional transportation system in those areas has to be fundamentally different than the discussion about how manage capacity in the existing centers. Development of the UGB areas (and the centers located within them) as they have been planned is critical to the success of the 2040. Existing centers will not be able to accommodate all growth (otherwise Metro would not have expanded the UGB). If appropriate and well planned growth is not accommodated in UGB expansion areas, there will be significant development pressure in inappropriate locations or at inappropriate densities as well as pressures to allow inefficient and sprawl-like development on the edge (or even outside the UGB). We would recommend that there be a very specific description of the UGB expansion areas in this section. This should lead to deliberate decisions about how	City of Gresham	Added language to the 2040 Growth Concept section describing the 1998 and 2002 urban growth boundary expansions. Language has also been added in a new Table 2 that acknowledges different parts of the region are at different development stages, and as a result, may have different transportation investment priorities. Additional discussion of this issue will also occur during Phase 3 to define additional strategies and funding mechanisms to address the needs in these areas as well as the developed and developing areas.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 07-3755

Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Working Drafts 1.0 and 2.0

Summary of Comments and Recommendations (comments received Jan. 5 through Feb. 14, 2007)

Comment #	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	investments will be made in those areas and the regional transportation system created.		
209.	Page 16 (Objective 1.2); page 17 (objective 2.1); page 21 (Objectives 4.3, 4.4); and page 22 (objective 5.1). Each of the objectives state placing the highest priority on making investments for each of the respective objectives. How will investment priority decisions work across these different objectives. Not everything can be "the highest priority." For example, it is important to discuss how to deal with placing the highest priority on investments "that provide access to and within Central City and regional centers and intermodal facilities" versus "maintaining travel time reliability ...on the regional freight network." Also how do these priority objectives match with the hierarchy in Table 1?	City of Gresham	Added language to clarify that those investments that help achieve multiple objectives and goals should be the highest priority to get the best return on public investments. The prioritization criteria and process will be developed during Phase 3 to screen projects forwarded to the RTP process by ODOT, local governments and special districts. 2040 land use designations in Table 1 will also be part of the prioritization methodology.
210.	Policy framework seems to not recognize the need and aspiration to raise new revenues to fund transportation needs.	City of Beaverton,	Language has been added to more clearly state new revenues are needed in the executive summary, governance concept and in Goal 8. The policy framework also recognizes that because raising new revenue is so difficult, a prudent step is first to demonstrate to the public that they're currently getting a good return on investment for their tax dollars. More specific revenue raising policy discussions will occur during Phase 3 as part of developing the financially constrained revenue forecast and long-term finance strategy to fund needed transportation investments.
211.	Need to involve engineers more in level-of-service discussion how it should inform decision-making process. .	Clackamas County	Agree. During Phase 3, Metro will convene a special workshop of interested engineers to help inform application of LOS in RTP system development and analysis.
212.	Need to emphasize managing capacity of the existing transportation system.	Multnomah County	Agree. Policy framework emphasizes.
213.	Safety is not prominent enough in policy framework.	City of Portland, City of Beaverton	Goal 5 focuses on safety and language has been added to more emphasize safety.



DATE: February 22, 2007
TO: TPAC and Interested Parties
FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Consideration of Policy Issues and “Friendly Amendments” Raised by MTAC

Background

This memorandum summarizes outstanding issues and proposed “friendly amendments” raised by the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) with their approval Resolution No. 07-3755 on February 21. The issues and amendments are for consideration by the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

MTAC Recommendations

- (1) Approval of the resolution was subject to MPAC discussion of the following outstanding issues:
 1. What 2040 design types are the highest priority for investments in the regional transportation system to best implement the Region 2040 vision? (Refer to Table 1 on page 3 of the recommended draft RTP policy framework) Possible amendments include:
 - *consider moving local industrial areas to secondary land use components category*
 - *consider moving station communities to secondary land use components category*
 2. What should the regional investment priorities be for different parts of the region? (Refer to Table 2 on page 5 of the recommended draft RTP policy framework)
- (2) In addition, MTAC requested staff to formally highlight additional work that will be conducted during Phase 3 to address outstanding policy issues raised by MTAC and others for MPAC discussion, including:
 - Further refinement of the array of potential performance measures (including level-of-service) identified in the draft policy framework and their application in the Phase 3 RTP analysis, documentation of compliance with statewide planning goals and post-RTP implementation activities to be conducted by local governments (including local plan development, collection of system development charges and development review).
 - Better delineation of areas in the region that cannot achieve the ideal arterial and collector/local street grid system due to constraints (e.g., existing development, streams, topography, freeways, rail lines) and how that affects prioritization of investments.
 - Further refinement and definition of the Regional Freight Network Concept through the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Plan process, including identification of critical freight connections and bottlenecks and applying the concept to inform prioritization of investments.

- Further refinement of the potential actions identified in the draft policy framework to respond to key findings of the Phase 3 analysis and policy discussions that will continue as the process moves forward.
- (3) Finally, MTAC identified several “friendly amendments” to the recommended draft RTP policy framework for consideration. Staff recommends TPAC and MPAC approval of these amendments.
- Page i of the Executive summary, add new bullet and text describing global warming as a trend to be addressed. Proposed text as follows:
Climate change poses a serious and growing threat to Oregon’s economy, natural resources, forests, rivers, agricultural lands, and coastline. Transportation activities are one of the largest sources of greenhouse gas emissions - it is estimated that transportation accounts for 38 percent of carbon dioxide emissions in Oregon and this is predicted to increase by 33 percent by 2025 because of increased driving.
 - Table 1 – Disaggregate industrial areas to list them separately as Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and Local Industrial Areas.
 - Table 2 – Revise “completing missing links” bullet in each column as follows:
Addressing bottlenecks and completing missing links to address barriers; and safety deficiencies and bottlenecks (e.g., bike and pedestrian connections, transit service, new throughway and arterial street connections and expansions).
 - Page 33 – Expand last sentence of first paragraph on storm water management to encourage other forms of storm water management beyond the green street examples described. Proposed text as follows:
Higher impervious surface coverage has been linked to dramatic changes in the shape of streams, water quality, water temperature and the biological health of waterways. The regional Green Streets program seeks to mitigate this effect on streams over time through a combination of retrofits to existing streets and design guidelines for new streets that include street tree canopy to intercept rainwater, techniques that allow stormwater to infiltrate directly into the ground and other infrastructure design and management strategies to reduce impervious surfaces and stormwater run-off from transportation facilities.
 - Page 19 - Revise Objective 6.1 Natural Environment as follows:
Protect ecological systems, habitat conservation areas and water quality and quantity, and avoid or minimize undesirable impacts on wildlife and fish habitat conservation areas, and wildlife corridors.
 - Page 19 - Revise Potential Performance Measures under Objective 6.1 as follows:
Acres of riparian and wildlife corridors impacted by new transportation infrastructure.
 - Page 19 - Revise Potential Actions for Objective 6.1 as follows:
 - Design transportation facilities that provide for wildlife movement where wildlife corridors cannot be avoided
 - Use Greenstreet Guidelines to reduce the number of stream crossings
 - Locate new transportation and related utility projects to avoid fragmentation and degradation of components of regionally significant parks, habitat, wildlife corridors, natural areas, open spaces, trails and greenways.

Page 3

Memo to TPAC and Interested Parties

Consideration of Policy Issues and “Friendly Amendments” Raised by MTAC

If you have any questions about the 2035 RTP update process, contact me at (503) 797-1617 or by e-mail at ellisk@metro.dst.or.us.

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



METRO


DATE: February 22, 2007
TO: RTP Interested Parties
FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Recommended Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapter 1 Policy Framework – Written Comments

Attached are all written comments received to date on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapter 1 Policy Framework - Recommended Draft (dated February 15, 2007) for reference.

If you have any questions about the 2035 RTP update process, contact me at (503) 797-1617 or by e-mail at ellisk@metro.dst.or.us.

Date: February 20, 2007

To: Kim Ellis

From: Jillian Detweiler 

Subject: Recommended RTP Chapter 1

This memo offers a couple of observations regarding the Recommended RTP Chapter 1.

- TriMet strongly supports the direction of this new RTP. We look forward to working with Metro as we try to identify the tools necessary to implement the approach embodied in Chapter 1.
- There could be a clearer distinction between “accessibility” and “mobility” at various places in the draft. We want “accessibility” to open our minds to the range of investments and strategies that will enable people to more easily secure, enjoy, participate in (access) housing, jobs, healthcare, education, groceries and the like. That ease represents a performance measure of both our land use plan and our transportation system. Accessibility is the reason our land use choices and transportation planning are “inextricably linked,” as are decisions such as affordable housing investments, business location incentives, parking charges, location of internet clouds and so on. The glossary definition of “Accessibility” still sounds more like the goal is to move around for the sake of moving around. In other places in the draft, accessibility seems to refer more narrowly to meeting the needs of disabled persons.
- Compared to the Working draft 2.0, the recommended draft elevates both Station Communities and Main Streets in the hierarchy of 2040 design types. TriMet supports this change.
- Corridors remain a secondary land use component, which we support, but this is an ambiguous term that needs attention:
 - The glossary definition for Corridors references “the average target densities.” It would be useful to state that density, because Corridor does not evoke a land use pattern.
 - As suggested by the glossary definition, a corridor can encompass many types of environments and land uses. It could be a single arterial street or a 2-mile wide “regional mobility corridor” as described elsewhere in the chapter. As suggested by Commissioner Peterson, corridors narrowly defined, present redevelopment and transit-oriented opportunities that deserve some focus within the RTP.

Thank you, again, for this opportunity to comment. Please let us know if you have questions.



20 February 2007

Rex Burkholder
Metro District 5 Councilor
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Councilor Burkholder:

I would like to express my appreciation for Metro's hard work in preparing the updated Regional Transportation Plan. The region's transportation future is at a critical juncture, and Metro is approaching it from the progressive perspective for which it has developed an international reputation.

In particular, I congratulate you on your thoughtful position favoring a systems approach focused on desired outcomes versus a laundry list of projects. The region's transportation planning efforts to date put us in comparatively good standing to meet the growing challenges of energy security, peak oil and global climate change, as well as providing our citizens with an economic vitality and quality of life that few regions can match. Thank you for continuing this tradition of planning for the next generation of transportation challenges.

Thank you again for your focus on a creative outcome-based approach to our region's transportation needs.

Best,

Sam Adams
Portland City Commissioner

Cc: Portland City Council
Metro Regional Council
Sue Keil, Director, PDOT



February 22, 2007

To: Kim Ellis and Tom Kloster
From: Mike Houck
Re: Comments on RTP Language

Kim and Tom,

At yesterday's MTAC meeting I mentioned some language change I would like to see and promised to follow up with the verbiage. It is as follows:
RTP, Page 19, Goal 6 Human Health and the Environment

As I mentioned yesterday, transportation facilities have significant impacts on wildlife movement, especially where there are corridors through which wildlife species move. While you do mention fish passage as an important issue to address, there is no explicit mention of wildlife corridors, what potential performance measures there might be and potential actions. I recommend the language be changed in the following ways (track changes, with additions in red):

Objective 6.1 Natural Environment-
Protect ecological systems, habitat conservation areas and water quality and quantity*, and avoid or minimize undesirable impacts on wildlife and fish habitat conservation areas, and wildlife corridors.

Potential Performance Measures:
Acres of riparian and wildlife corridors impacted by new transportation infrastructure.

Under Potential Actions:
Design transportation facilities that provide for wildlife movement where wildlife corridors cannot be avoided

Use Greenstreet Guidelines to reduce the number of stream crossings

Locate new transportation and related utility projects to avoid fragmentation and degradation of components of regionally significant parks, habitat, wildlife corridors, natural areas, open spaces, trails and greenways.

*Given the tremendous impact that the transportation system induces vis a vis increased stormwater volume, water quantity should always be mentioned along with quality.

By the way, I am impressed with the environmental considerations you have included in this draft of the RTP. Excellent work, in my opinion.

Directors

Goody Cable, Chair
M. J. Cody, Vice Chair
Bob Wilson, Secretary/Treasurer

Staff

Mike Houck, Executive Director

Advisory Board

Bill Bakke
Native Fish Society
Portland, Oregon

Janet Santos Cobb
California Oak Foundation
Oakland, California

Patrick M. Condon
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC

John Fregonese
Fregonese Calthorpe & Associates
Portland, Oregon

Charles Jordan
The Conservation Fund
Portland, Oregon

Jon Kusler
International Institute of Wetland
Science and Public Policy
Berne, New York

Robert Liberty
Senior Counsel for
Congressman Earl Blumenauer
Portland, Oregon

Peg Malloy
Portland Housing Center
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Rutherford Platt
Ecological Cities Project
Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Joe Poracsky
Geography Department
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

Rodolpho H. Ramina, PhD.
Ecodesign Coordinator
Industrial Federation of
Paraná State, Curitiba, Brazil

Ann Riley
Waterways Restoration Institute
Berkeley, California

Ralph Thomas Rogers
Urban Ecologist
Seattle, Washington

Jennifer Thompson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Portland, Oregon

Paddy Tillett
Architect and Urban Designer
Portland, Oregon

Mike Uhtoff
Northwest Nature Shop
Ashland, Oregon

Dr. Alan Yeakley
Environmental Sciences and
Resources
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon



Date: February 22, 2007
To: TPAC and interested parties
From: Andy Back, Principal Planner
Subject: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Changes to Chapter 1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Chapter 1 of the RTP. We have limited recommended changes to this draft. They are listed in Attachment 1 and specifically pertain to Goal 1 - Great Communities and Goal 9 – Accountability. We hope they will be included in any TPAC recommendation that is presented to JPACT. We understand that Chapter 1 is the “kick-off” for the RTP and that it is a “provisional draft” that will likely change during future phases of RTP development. While we know there are many outstanding issues, we believe it is reasonable for Metro to go forward with the RTP development. We would describe our stance as being “cautiously optimistic”. The comments below reflect this cautious optimism, and we submit them as views to keep in mind as we move into Phase 3 – System Development and Analysis.

***The Shape of the Region** – We are excited about the work Metro is doing regarding urban reserves and rural reserves. We believe these are critical tools to create and utilize in order to effectively manage transportation in the future. They will enhance our ability to both achieve a jobs-housing balance and create vibrant multi-modal new communities. We also note that the RTP is being developed prior to any decisions about how and where to expand the UGB to accommodate growth through the year 2035. Given that we expect a million more people to reside here in the next 25 years, the transportation decisions we make over the next year will likely need to be transitional and short-lived until we more specifically figure out where this substantial increase in population will live and work.*

***Prior Commitments and Plans** – While it makes good sense to look ahead to 2035, it is also wise not to “start from scratch.” When the first UGB was established in the late 1970’s, the transportation needs for the region were largely set in place. In 1988 in Washington County, these transportation needs were more specifically identified in an adopted and acknowledged Transportation Plan that included numerous projects to address this need. The list of needs and projects were further refined in Washington County in an updated plan adopted and acknowledged in 2002. Hundreds of land use decisions have already been made on unfunded transportation projects that were identified as being necessary through 2020. As we move forward, the focus must be on*

addressing the additional transportation needs created by population and employment growth from 2020 – 2035. Doubting and revisiting the decisions we've made in previously adopted and acknowledged plans will not be a fruitful exercise. We also note that the "closer" we get to 2035, the RTP will be more speculative. Excessively adjusting transportation decisions and commitments based on distant forecasts does not seem very prudent.

***If there's a will, there's a way** – It's true that we simply do not currently have enough money to address all the transportation needs in the region. We are hopeful that as the RTP moves forward that the lack of current funds doesn't overly dampen our desire to undertake aspirational planning. Westside LRT and the County's successful MSTIP program are a couple of good examples of where we've collectively come together to fund transportation projects that, otherwise, would have been deemed impossible due to financial constraint. Finding that equilibrium between financial constraint and aspiration will be important as we move forward with the RTP. Having a plan that leans too far to the side of financial constraint is not the best way to develop a transportation system that will allow us to compete in the global economy and protect our enviable quality of life.*

***Honoring Diversity** – We're a big region and all the sub-areas of the region are not identical. That's a good thing! As we move forward with development of the RTP it will be important to keep in mind the diversity of the region. Transportation solutions in one part of the region may not be appropriate in other parts of the region. A "one size fits all" answer to our tough and numerous transportation questions simply won't work.*

I hope these comments are useful. Again, our specific comments on Chapter 1 are found in the following attachment. Thank you.

Attachment 1

1. Goal 1 Great Communities (page 11)

Objective 1.2 2040 Implementation – add and modify as indicated:

Place the highest priority on investments that provide access to and within the Central City, regional centers, **industrial areas**, station communities and intermodal facilities.

Potential Performance Measures:

- Percent of transportation investments ~~in~~ **servicing** highest priority.....

Add a new Potential Action

- Work with the private development community to gain a better understanding of the role transportation infrastructure plays in making land development investment decisions for projects in 2040 land use districts. Investigate, evaluate and seek funding as appropriate for non-transportation tools to leverage 2040 land uses. Examine the difference between improvements providing access to 2040 land uses versus improvements within 2040 land uses.

2. Goal 9 Accountability (page 22) add an Objective that states the following -

Objective 9.4 Jurisdictional Responsibility – Develop a regionally accepted classification or description that very clearly defines which level of government is primarily responsible and principally accountable for planning, funding and managing different components of the transportation system. Different government will be primarily responsible for different components.

Potential Performance Measure :

- Percent of a particular government's transportation investments that are spent on that government's primary transportation responsibility

Potential Actions

- Prior to adoption of the RTP, work with JPACT and others to develop a definition or description that very clearly defines transportation responsibility by type of jurisdiction
- Monitor transportation investments to ensure consistency with the definition or description.



Date: February 22, 2007
To: TPAC and interested parties
From: Andy Back, Principal Planner
Subject: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Changes to Chapter 1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Chapter 1 of the RTP. We have limited recommended changes to this draft. They are listed in Attachment 1 and specifically pertain to Goal 1 - Great Communities and Goal 9 – Accountability. We hope they will be included in any TPAC recommendation that is presented to JPACT. We understand that Chapter 1 is the “kick-off” for the RTP and that it is a “provisional draft” that will likely change during future phases of RTP development. While we know there are many outstanding issues, we believe it is reasonable for Metro to go forward with the RTP development. We would describe our stance as being “cautiously optimistic”. The comments below reflect this cautious optimism, and we submit them as views to keep in mind as we move into Phase 3 – System Development and Analysis.

***The Shape of the Region** – We are excited about the work Metro is doing regarding urban reserves and rural reserves. We believe these are critical tools to create and utilize in order to effectively manage transportation in the future. They will enhance our ability to both achieve a jobs-housing balance and create vibrant multi-modal new communities. We also note that the RTP is being developed prior to any decisions about how and where to expand the UGB to accommodate growth through the year 2035. Given that we expect a million more people to reside here in the next 25 years, the transportation decisions we make over the next year will likely need to be transitional and short-lived until we more specifically figure out where this substantial increase in population will live and work.*

***Prior Commitments and Plans** – While it makes good sense to look ahead to 2035, it is also wise not to “start from scratch.” When the first UGB was established in the late 1970’s, the transportation needs for the region were largely set in place. In 1988 in Washington County, these transportation needs were more specifically identified in an adopted and acknowledged Transportation Plan that included numerous projects to address this need. The list of needs and projects were further refined in Washington County in an updated plan adopted and acknowledged in 2002. Hundreds of land use decisions have already been made on unfunded transportation projects that were identified as being necessary through 2020. As we move forward, the focus must be on*

addressing the additional transportation needs created by population and employment growth from 2020 – 2035. Doubting and revisiting the decisions we've made in previously adopted and acknowledged plans will not be a fruitful exercise. We also note that the "closer" we get to 2035, the RTP will be more speculative. Excessively adjusting transportation decisions and commitments based on distant forecasts does not seem very prudent.

***If there's a will, there's a way** – It's true that we simply do not currently have enough money to address all the transportation needs in the region. We are hopeful that as the RTP moves forward that the lack of current funds doesn't overly dampen our desire to undertake aspirational planning. Westside LRT and the County's successful MSTIP program are a couple of good examples of where we've collectively come together to fund transportation projects that, otherwise, would have been deemed impossible due to financial constraint. Finding that equilibrium between financial constraint and aspiration will be important as we move forward with the RTP. Having a plan that leans too far to the side of financial constraint is not the best way to develop a transportation system that will allow us to compete in the global economy and protect our enviable quality of life.*

***Honoring Diversity** – We're a big region and all the sub-areas of the region are not identical. That's a good thing! As we move forward with development of the RTP it will be important to keep in mind the diversity of the region. Transportation solutions in one part of the region may not be appropriate in other parts of the region. A "one size fits all" answer to our tough and numerous transportation questions simply won't work.*

I hope these comments are useful. Again, our specific comments on Chapter 1 are found in the following attachment. Thank you.

Attachment 1

1. Goal 1 Great Communities (page 11)

Objective 1.2 2040 Implementation – add and modify as indicated:

Place the highest priority on investments that provide access to and within the Central City, regional centers, **industrial areas**, station communities and intermodal facilities.

Potential Performance Measures:

- Percent of transportation investments ~~in~~ **servicing** highest priority.....

Add a new Potential Action

- Work with the private development community to gain a better understanding of the role transportation infrastructure plays in making land development investment decisions for projects in 2040 land use districts. Investigate, evaluate and seek funding as appropriate for non-transportation tools to leverage 2040 land uses. Examine the difference between improvements providing access to 2040 land uses versus improvements within 2040 land uses.

2. Goal 9 Accountability (page 22) add an Objective that states the following -

Objective 9.4 Jurisdictional Responsibility – Develop a regionally accepted classification or description that very clearly defines which level of government is primarily responsible and principally accountable for planning, funding and managing different components of the transportation system. Different government will be primarily responsible for different components.

Potential Performance Measure :

- Percent of a particular government's transportation investments that are spent on that government's primary transportation responsibility

Potential Actions

- Prior to adoption of the RTP, work with JPACT and others to develop a definition or description that very clearly defines transportation responsibility by type of jurisdiction
- Monitor transportation investments to ensure consistency with the definition or description.

Progress Report from the “TPAC ITS Study Group”

Background:

At its December 5, 2006 meeting, TPAC dispatched a small “study group” to examine the question of how best to address the fact that while TransPort is effective with regard to ITS implementation, there is a void related to developing a regional ITS policy and strategy. On January 31, the study group met, with representatives of TPAC (Weinman, Selinger, Back, McCaffrey) and TransPort (Bill Kloos, PDOT; Dennis Mitchell, ODOT; Jon Makler, Metro). This brief progress report represents the group’s consensus on an approach to near-, mid-, and long-term responsibilities.

Finding:

There is a need for a planning/policy group to serve as an intermediate step between TPAC and TransPort. The group would be oriented toward Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) policy, which encompasses ITS. TransPort would remain the venue for coordinating the implementation of ITS.

The new group would have the following oversight responsibilities

- Development of the RTP’s system management policies and measures
- Development of a regional strategy plan for system management and ITS
- Development of an investment plan (re: CIP) for regional ITS investments
- Ongoing evaluation of system management and ITS strategy effectiveness

In addition, the new group would serve as a conduit between TPAC and TransPort. On one hand, this includes helping TransPort advocate for financial and policy support of ITS investments at TPAC. On the other hand, this includes helping TPAC provide implementation guidance to TransPort.

Meetings & Memberships:

This group should meet quarterly or more frequently as needed. There should be twelve members representing:

- Washington, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties
- Cities of each County (like TPAC) plus City of Beaverton, Gresham and Portland
- ODOT, TriMet, Metro, Portland State University
- Liaison from TransPort, TPAC, and RTO

Next Steps:

The study group sees the need for immediate engagement with the RTP. As an interim solution, an ad-hoc version of the new group should continue to meet as needed (probably monthly) to provide input for the development of the RTP’s system management elements. The ad-hoc group will also work on the creation of a charter (re: bylaws) for its eventual formalization. The timeline for that is related to the sub-allocation of MTIP funds, which will need to be done by the start of Federal Fiscal Year 2010 and on the basis of the to-be-developed regional TSMO/ITS strategy plan.



March 2007

*Transportation Priorities 2008-11
Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept*

Final Public Comment Report

Metropolitan Transportation
Improvement Program (MTIP)



METRO

PEOPLE PLACES
OPEN SPACES

Metro

People places • open spaces

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy and good transportation choices for people and businesses in our region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges that cross those lines and affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to protecting open space, caring for parks, planning for the best use of land, managing garbage disposal and increasing recycling. Metro oversees world-class facilities such as the Oregon Zoo, which contributes to conservation and education, and the Oregon Convention Center, which benefits the region's economy.

Your Metro representatives

Metro Council President – David Bragdon

Metro Councilors – Rod Park, District 1; Brian Newman, District 2; Carl Hosticka, District 3; Kathryn Harrington, District 4; Rex Burkholder, District 5; Robert Liberty, District 6.

Auditor – Suzanne Flynn

Metro's web site

www.metro-region.org

Non-discrimination Notice to the Public

Metro hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the Metro Council to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI requires that no person in the United States of America shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, or national origin, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance. Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with Metro. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with the Metro's Title VI Coordinator within one hundred eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Discrimination Complaint Form, see the web site at www.metro-region.org or call (503) 797-1536.

Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
(503) 797-1700

Transportation Priorities 2008-11

Final Public Comment Report

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	
Section 1: Summary of Comments.....	2-1
Section 2: Table of Comments	3-1
Section 3: Comments	
Minutes of the Public Hearing on February 13, 2007.....	4-1
Testimony Forms	4-10
Letters.....	4-171
Post Cards	4-179
E-Mail Comments	4-185
Section 4: Appendix	
Public Notification and Outreach.....	5-1
Section 5: Index.....	6-1

Introduction

This report presents a compilation of public comments received from February 5 through February 13, 2007, on a draft final list of funding recommendations. The funding recommendations are part of Metro's 2008–11 Transportation Priorities process. The Transportation Priorities process selects projects to receive the "flexible funding" part of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The flexible funds, administered by Metro, comprise about 13% of the region's federal transportation investment and about 4% of the region's total transportation investment (including state, county and local funds).

The flexible funds come from two federal funding categories—the Surface Transportation Program funds and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds. They are called flexible because they may be invested in more types of projects than may most federal funds. The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council have directed that the funds be invested to support the region's 2040 Growth Concept, to leverage economic development in centers of economic activity, support modes of travel that do not have other dedicated sources of funding, complete missing links in transportation systems, and provide transportation choices for people and businesses.

Metro received 66 applications for projects and programs requesting a total of \$132 million. Only \$45.4 million are actually available for new funding obligation. The 66 applications included projects to plan or improve boulevards, bike and trails systems, freight routes, vehicle routes, bridges, sidewalks, and transit facilities, as well as regional programs such as those promoting transit oriented developments and transportation options.

The applications were evaluated for technical feasibility and readiness. Based on that evaluation, Metro planning staff and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), a technical advisory committee to JPACT, created a first-cut list of funding recommendations. That first-cut list recommended funding for 49 of the 67 applications and represented \$79.6 million in funding requests. A 45-day public comment period was held from October 13–December 1, 2006, to help select a draft final project list that more closely matches the available \$45.4 million.

On February 5, 2007, TPAC released its draft final list recommendation for public review and comment, consisting of 32 projects and programs to receive \$45.4 million of funding. The review and comment period ended on February 13, 2007, when JPACT and the Metro Council held a joint public hearing on the draft final in preparation for taking final action. JPACT is tentatively scheduled to take final action on March 1, 2007, and the Metro Council on March 15, 2007. (Confirm the date and time with the Council Office, 303-797-1540, or check the Metro website at www.metro-region.org.)

Thanks to everyone who took the time to write or testify and to the neighborhood associations, advocacy groups, business associations and government stakeholders that encourage members to participate in this important function of democracy.

Section 1: Summary of Comments

Summary of Comments

This section summarizes comments received on the funding recommendations for the regional flexible fund part of the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

The final public review and comment period began on February 5, 2007, with release of the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee's (TPAC) recommended funding levels on a draft final list of projects and programs. The period ended with a public hearing held by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council on February 13, 2007. Metro received a total of 1,193 comments on this draft final list delivered in the form of oral and written testimony, and as letters, petitions, signed statements and emails.

More than 100 individuals attended the public hearing. Eighty of those attending offered either oral or written testimony, or both. Several testifiers spoke on behalf of one or more organizations; in at least two instances, testifiers presented signatures indicating the support of hundreds of other people.

Comments received during this final comment period and during the first-cut comment period are summarized below. (A full report on the first-cut comment period was published in January 2007.) Please keep in mind when comparing remarks receiving during the two comment periods that the first comment period comprised 45 days and four public listening posts; the second comment period comprised 8 days and one public hearing.

Boulevard

East Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave

Final comment period: 6 comments, 5 in favor as necessary to support revitalization. The 1 opposed said that the project needs to be better thought out.

First-cut comment period: 29 comments, all but 2 in favor as a way to support better bike connections and promote development. Opposition criticized the design and questioned whether the project would be safe for buses and truck.

Killingsworth: N Commercial to MLK

Final comment period: 21 comments in favor of the project (6 individual submissions of which one represented 8 other organizations and one represented 7 other organizations. Reasons included revitalization and the need for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in an area heavily used by students and transit-dependent residents.

First-cut comment period: 1 comment in support, citing a needed link between nearby neighborhoods and MAX.

NE 102nd Avenue: NE Glisan to NE Stark

Final comment period: 2 comments in favor, citing the need for improvements in this area and the fact that the project is ready to go.

First-cut comment period: 12 comments, 10 in support of this project as a way to promote safety and economic development; 2 opposed, with 1 citing concerns about the design, and the other suggesting that the project should be paid for by local businesses.

SE Burnside: 181 Street to Stark Street

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor, citing support for the Rockwood Town Center.

First-cut comment period: 15 comments, all in favor of the project as a way to spur economic development, improve bike and pedestrian facilities, and address safety issues.

Rose Biggi Ave: Southwest Hall Blvd to Crescent Way

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 2 comments, 1 supporting a connection to The Round, and the other opposing the project.

East Baseline Street, Cornelius: 10th Ave to 19th Ave

Final comment period: 916 total comments in favor of the project (10 submissions, one accompanied by 905 signed endorsements).

First-cut comment period: 19 comments, 18 strongly favorable, citing badly needed improvements for pedestrian and bicycle safety and to promote downtown development; the 1 opposed said project would be "a travesty."

McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River to Dunes Drive

Final comment period: 7 comments in favor, citing the importance of the project to supporting Milwaukie as a Regional Center, providing connections to transit, and improving the aesthetic to encourage tourism.

First-cut comment period: 18 comments, all in support of the project as a way to provide access to the river and to improve bike and pedestrian connections.

Boones Ferry Road: Red Cedar Way to S of Reese Road

Final comment period: 2 comments in favor, citing the need to address safety issues and to catalyze development of Lake Grove as a Village Center.

First-cut comment period: 57 comments, 20 supported the project as a way to improve safety and promote development of a town center; 37 opposed the project citing lacking in public involvement and absence of an economic impact study. The Lake Grove Commercial Association submitted a petition containing 2,458 signatures that asked that funding be delayed until the public had been consulted and the economic impact studied.

Bike/Trail

Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave

Final comment period: 26 total comments in favor (one submission represented and additional 17 neighborhood associations).

First-cut comment period: 66 comments, 65 from residents, developers, businesses and agencies, supporting this trail as a boon to development, to bicycle commuting and recreation, and to pedestrian connections. One individual did not explicitly state a position, but questioned Metro's sponsorship of the project.

Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs to SW Lowell

Final comment period: 166 comments in favor (including one petition with 101 signatures, and 34 statements individually signed). Reasons included the need to serve a rapidly growing population of residents and workers in an area with lots of construction and heavy bike and pedestrian use. The trail was approved for funding two cycles ago, but the money was used for the streetcar instead.

First-cut comment period: 124 comments, 42 in favor from residents of the area supporting the project as a connection to other trails for bicycle and pedestrian use and as important for developing the area (one included a petition with 80 supporting signatures); 2 opposed the project.

NE/SE 50s Bikeway: NE Thompson to SE Woodstock

Final comment period: 2 comments, 1 in favor, and 1 opposed.

First-cut comment period: 45 comments, all but 1 supporting what was often described as a needed north-south bike route. One individual opposed the project, citing over-representation of bicycle projects.

NE/SE 70s Bikeway 70s: NE Killingsworth to SE Clatsop

Final comment period: 2 comments, 1 in favor, and 1 opposed.

First-cut comment period: 34 comments similar in content to those submitted on the NE/SE 50s Bikeway project—33 in favor and 1 opposed.

Rock Creek Path: Orchard Park to NW Wilkins

Final comment period: 2 comments in favor, citing the need to fill gaps in the system and provide an alternative to car travel.

First-cut comment period: 20 comments, 18 cited the need for a safe connector for runners, walkers, and bikers; 2 opposed the project.

Westside Corridor Trail: Tualatin to Willamette Rivers

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the need to fill gaps in the system and provide an alternative to car travel.

First-cut comment period: 38 comments, 37 in favor of connecting with other trails, providing safe pathways for pedestrians and bike riders and access to nature. One comment objected to funding trails in general.

Northwest 28th PE: NE Grant to East Main Street

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 3 comments in favor, but 2 of those expressing reservations about particular design features.

Marine Drive Bike Facility Gaps: NE 6th to NE 185th

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 24 comments in favor from residents, and organizations, citing the need to complete the bicycle route for safety as well as connectivity.

Trolley Trail: Arista St to Glen Echo

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor, citing the need to repair gaps in a multi-modal network.

First-cut comment period: 36 comments, 34 supporting the project as a positive addition to a trail system that promotes exercise and non-auto commuting. The 2 in opposition objected to spending money on trails and on bicycle projects, which were seen as over-represented.

Milwaukie to Lake Oswego Trail

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 40 comments, 37 in favor of supporting safe bicycle routes, especially for seniors. The 3 comments not in favor included 1 that suggested transit on this route; 1 that objected to funding bicycle facilities, and 1 that said the project would not solve transportation problems.

Willamette Falls Dr: 10th St to Willamette Dr

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor of enhancing the livability of the area.

NE 28th Ave preliminary engineering: NE Grant to E. Main St

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: no comment.

Diesel Retrofit

Sierra Cascade SmartWay Technology: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 15 comments, 14 in favor of this program as a way to promote fuel efficiency and reduce emissions; 1 did not support the program.

Transit bus emission reduction: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 5 comments, all in favor of the program as a way to reduce pollution.

Freight

N Burgard/Lombard: N Columbia Blvd to UPRR Bridge

Final comment period: 2 comment in favor.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor, citing the opportunity to keep trucks out of the St. Johns neighborhood.

Portland Road/Columbia Blvd

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor.

First-cut comment period: 6 comments, 5 favoring this project as a way to protect St Johns neighborhood; 1 expressed concerned about cut-through traffic if more freight were to travel on Portland Road.

82nd Ave/Columbia Intersection Improvements

Final comment period: 4 comments in favor.

First-cut comment period: 9 comments, 7 supporting the project as a way to move freight, reduce auto-truck conflicts, and promote economic competitiveness. The 2 opposed included 1 contention that the Port of Portland should fund the project.

Green Streets Culvert

OR 99-E Bridge at Kellogg Lake

Final comment period: 3 comments (1 submissions with 2 cosigners) in favor to protect fish habitat.

First-cut comment period: 38 strongly in favor of this project as a way to restore fish habitat as well as to provide safe facilities for bike riders and pedestrians.

Green Streets Retrofit

Cully Boulevard: NE Prescott to NE Killingsworth

Second comment period: 6 comments in favor, citing badly needed safety improvements in an area that has not had a project in 20 years.

First-cut comment period: 55 comments that indicated broad support, including comments from elected officials representing the area, businesses, residents and neighborhood associations. Support included the need to make crucial safety improvements that were long overdue in an underserved area. There was no opposition.

Main Street: Rail Corridor to 99W, Tigard

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor, citing the integration with other improvements and the need to better handle storm water runoff

First-cut comment period: 26 comments, 25 in favor of the project as a way to promote revitalizing of the downtown, promote pedestrian activity and improve stormwater management; 1 did not support the project.

Pedestrian

Sandy Blvd pedestrian improvements: NE 17 to NE Wasco St

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 2 comments, one in favor of the project as a way to improve safety; 1 opposed to the project suggested that the money be spent instead on improving crossing safety.

Foster-Woodstock: SE 87th St to SE 101 St

Final comment period: 2 comments in favor, citing the need to improve pedestrian safety.

First-cut comment period: 35 comments, 34 in favor of the project as a way to spur revitalization of the area and promote safety for seniors and children; 1 opposed the project.

Hood Street: SE Division Street to SE Powell Blvd

Final comment period: 2 comments in favor, citing the need for pedestrian facilities, make the area ADA compliant, and provide link to transit near a proposed Center for the Arts.

First-cut comment period: 13 comments, 12 favor the project as a way to improve access to transit, pedestrian safety, and spur economic development; 1 opposed.

SE 17th Ave: SE Ochoco to SE Lava Drive

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor, citing town revitalization and need to fill a gap in bike connections.

First-cut comment period: 31 comments in favor of this project as a way to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities and address safety issues; none opposed.

Fanno Creek trail: Hall Blvd crossing study

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the extreme hazard of the current crossing.

First-cut comment period: 88 comments, 86 in favor of this project as a way to fix a dangerous crossing at Hall Blvd and provide needed bicycle and pedestrian connections to a natural area; 2 comments opposed, 1 cited the expense of a bridge, and the other suggested installing a traffic light instead.

Pine Street: Willamette St to Sunset Blvd

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 1 comment in favor.

Pedestrian Network Analysis: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 5 comments, 4 in support of the program as a way to identify gaps in the system; 1 was noncommittal, but mentioned the Cedar Mill trail.

Planning

Rx for Big Streets: Metro region 2040 corridors

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 3 comments in favor.

Livable Streets policy and guidebook update: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor.

Hillsboro RC planning study

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 1 comment opposed the study as being ambiguous.

Happy Valley Town Center arterial street planning

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 3 comments in favor of the project, citing the need for bike and pedestrian facilities and the need to improve safety.

Tanasbourne Town Center planning study: Hillsboro

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: no comment.

MPO Program: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: no comment.

RTP corridor project: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: no comment.

Road Capacity

ITS Programmatic Allocation: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 5 comments, 4 in favor of this program as a cost-efficient way to manage traffic; 1 opposed funding more ways to move traffic.

Wood Village Blvd: NE Halsey St to NE Arata Rd

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 5 comments, 4 in favor of this project as a way to address congestion; 1 opposed, expressing concern that the project would create more traffic.

Tualatin-Sherwood Road ATMS: 99W to SW Teton Rd

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor of this project as a low-cost way to manage congestions.

Highway 217: Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy to SW Allen Blvd

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the need to provide road capacity and support the state's economy.

First-cut comment period: 8 comments, 6 in favor of the project as a way to address congestion; 2 opposed the project for the expense and for environmental reasons.

Farmington Road: SW Murray Blvd to SW Hocken Ave

Final comment period: 3 comments, 2 in favor citing the need to make improvements that will accommodate growth in the area; 1 opposed to spending the money where no improvements are needed.

First-cut comment period: 19 comments, 15 in favor of the project as a way to address congestion; 4 opposed said it was not going to solve the problem.

Cornell Road ATMS and ATIS: Hillsboro to US 26

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 3 comments, 2 in favor of the project as a cost-efficient way to manage traffic; 1 opposed for expense reasons.

Sue/Dogwood Connection: NW Dale to NW Saltzman

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 1 comment supported the connection.

Harmony Road: 82nd Ave to Highway 224

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 15 comments, 5 in favor as a way to address congestion; 10 opposed the project expressing environmental and safety concerns; 1 comment took no position, but asked if TriMet would serve the area and whether pedestrian facilities would be built.

Clackamas County ITS: Clackamas County

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 7 comments, 5 in favor of ITSA as a way to maximize existing system capacity; 1 did not "fully support" and 1 opposed, saying that this type of project should not be funded until other priorities had been addressed.

SE 172nd Ave: Multnomah Co line to Sunnyside Rd

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 8 comments, 4 in favor of this connection to Damascus; 4 opposed to spending more money on car travel or a facility that wouldn't work with bike lanes.

SE 190th Dr: Pleasant View/Highland to SW 30th St

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor, citing the need to develop Pleasant Valley in a way that supports 2040 goals

First-cut comment period: 24 comments, 23 favored the project as necessary to development of Pleasant Valley; 1 opposed, expressing concern over converting a quiet road to higher speed.

Large Bridge

Morrison Bridge: Willamette River, Portland

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor of improving this vital connection to downtown Portland.

Road Reconstruction

Division Street: SE 6th St to 39th St

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the need to improve safety and the fact that the project is ready to go.

First-cut comment period: 49 comments, 47 in favor of this project, citing support for development, business, bicycle riders and pedestrians; 2 opposed, saying it would not improve safety.

223rd RR Undercrossing at Sandy Boulevard

Final comment period: 9 comments in favor, citing the urgent need to fix a very dangerous situation for pedestrians, bicyclists and cars.

First-cut comment period: 40 comments, 39 in favor of fixing what was seen as a dangerous situation for autos, bicyclists, and pedestrians; 1 opposed, expressing concern over the potential for increasing in traffic in Fairview.

Transit Oriented Development

Metro TOD Implementation Program: region wide

Final comment period: 10 comments in favor, citing the need for TOD programs to leverage private investment and make these kinds of developments pencil out.

First-cut comment period: 9 comments, 28 in favor of a program with a proven track record, that supports 2040 goals, and that encourages public-private partnerships; 1 opposed programs that benefit developers.

Metro Centers Implementation Program: region wide

Final comment period: 8 comments in favor, citing the demonstrated success of supporting mixed-use areas that can be served by transit.

First-cut comment period: 30 comments; 29 in favor of a program that supports 2040 goals, improves economic vitality, and promotes healthy public-private partnerships; 1 opposed the program as benefiting developers.

Hollywood Transit Center: NE Halsey and NE 42nd St

Final comment period: 2 comments, in favor of making needed safety improvements and to support transit ridership; 1 opposed

First-cut comment period: 52 comments, 49 expressing strong support for this project as a way to improve a poor design, support local business development and improve access to transit; 3 opposed—1 questioned whether safety would improve; 1 objected to curb extensions; 1 simply opposed the project.

Regional Travel Options

Regional Travel Options: region wide

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the importance of the program in reducing SOV travel, supporting successful centers.

First-cut comment period: 15 comments, 14 in favor of promoting transportation choices; 1 opposed the program.

RTO individualized marketing program: region wide

Final comment period: 3 comments in favor, citing the importance of the program in educating people on alternatives to SOV travel.

First-cut comment period: 5 comments in favor of promoting transportation choices and reducing SOV use.

RTO new TMA Support: region wide

Final comment period: 2 comment in favor, citing the importance of the program in supporting TMA services that have demonstrated their value in reducing SOV commuting.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor of the program, citing benefits to employers and employees and reducing SOV travel.

Transit

South Corridor Phase II (PE): Portland to Milwaukie

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 11 comments favored this "long overdue" project; 1 had concerns.

Eastside Streetcar: NW 10th to NE Oregon

Final comment period: 1 comment in favor.

First-cut comment period: 14 comments, 9 in favor of adding another transit option and stimulating positive development; 5 opposed as not needed, too expensive, and lacking vision.

Tigard Transit Center: SW Commercial St, Tigard

Final comment period: no comment directly about this project, but the project was mentioned in related testimony as one of the several good revitalization efforts proposed or underway.

First-cut comment period: 12 comments in favor of a project seen as promoting downtown revitalization, connecting with commuter rail and enhancing the livability of the area.

On-street transit facilities: region wide

Final comment period: no comment.

First-cut comment period: 4 comments in favor of adding amenities that encourage transit use; none opposed.

General Comments

Final comment period: 3 comments received, 2 requesting more bike and pedestrian trails in SW Portland and 1 requesting light rail service in Tigard.

First-cut comment period: 34 comments were received that did not pertain to specific projects on the first-cut list. Comments ranged from general support for types of projects—pedestrian and bicycle improvements, for example—to suggestions for projects that are not on the current list, to a request that Metro address diversity in contracting.

Section 2: Table of Comments

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Testimony	Fry, Peter	Resident, Portland	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Build it now. Crucial to supporting development in this area.	Pro
Testimony	Holmes, Tim	Central Eastside Industrial Council	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Supports project	Pro
Email	Holmes, Tim	Central Eastside Industrial Council	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Please fully fund; important for revitalization	Pro
Testimony	Lindsay, Susan	Central Eastside Urban Renewal Advisory Committee	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Cornerstone of important redevelopment; please fully fund.	Pro
Testimony	Parker, Terry	Resident, Portland	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Needs to be better thought out	Con
Testimony	Wentworth, Greg	Wentworth Chevrolet	Portland	BD1089	E Burnside: 3rd Ave to 14th Ave	Supports the project.	Pro
Testimony	Deane, Kate	Several organizations	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Urged funding of this project on behalf of 15 local organizations, businesses, and groups	Pro
Testimony	Gatewood, Algie	PCC Cascade	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Support other investments in this area; support livability and reduce car dependency; support student needs	Pro
Letter	Halverson, Brad	Overlook Neighborhood Assn	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Vital catalyst to a healthy mixed-use street	Pro
Testimony	Haynes, Michelle	REACH	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Vital improvements for transit-dependent people and businesses they frequent	Pro
Letter	Humbolt Neighborhood Assn and 8 other organizations	Humbolt Neighborhood Assn and 8 other organizations	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Fill gap in bike and pedestrian improvements in area heavily used by students	Pro
Letter	Valenta, Walter	Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal	Portland	BD1221	Killingworth: N Commercial-MLK Jr. Blvd	Vital catalyst to a healthy mixed-use street	Pro
Testimony	Ernest, Bob	Gateway PAC	Portland	BD2015	NE 102nd Ave: NE Glisan-NE Stark	Supports project	Pro
Testimony	Warner, Dorene	Gateway PAC	Portland	BD2015	NE 102nd Ave: NE Glisan-NE Stark	Important to success of Gateway Regional Center; project is ready to go	Pro
Testimony	Bennett, Mike	City of Gresham	Gresham	BD2104	SE Burnside: 181 St-Stark St	Will enhance Rockwood Town Center; add access to transit, pedestrians, bikes	Pro
Testimony	Arauz, Consuelo	Resident, Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Essential for pedestrian safety, especially people with disabilities	Pro
Testimony	Arauz, Jose	Resident, Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	The community needs ways to walk to shopping, church, and schools	Pro
Email	Cordell, Vickie	Resident, Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Much needed to develop this area	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Email	Doyle, Ed and Cindy	Resident, Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Strongly support project	Pro
Letter	Garner, Jenny	Cornelius Chamber of Commerce	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Important for attracting new business	Pro
Email	Newlevant, Jack	Resident, Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Strongly supports project	Pro
Email	Pelayo, Victor	Mortgage broker	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Good for development of the area	Pro
Email	Sidman, Catherine	Sheldon Manufacturing	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Much needed to develop this area	Pro
Letter	Tucker, Margie	Crown Construction	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Good for development of the area	Pro
Testimony	Whisler, Terry	City of Cornelius	Cornelius	BD3169	E Baseline St, Cornelius: 10 Ave 19th Ave	Crucial to community development; submitted 906 letters from residents in support	Pro
Letter	Holveck, Amber	Oregon City Chamber of Commerce	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Economically crucial to Oregon City	Pro
Testimony	Holveck, Amber	Oregon City Chamber of Commerce	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Economically crucial to Oregon City	Pro
Testimony	Neeley, Doug	City of Oregon City	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Needed for connectivity to Main St, Clackamas Cove, Clackamette Park, and new developments	Pro
Testimony	Norris, Alice	City of Oregon City	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Needed to develop this Regional Center and encourage transit	Pro
Testimony	Richmond, Alice	Resident, Oregon City	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Improve aesthetic to promote tourism	Pro
Testimony	Schumaker, Ted	Oregon City Parks and Rec Advisory Committee	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Provides needed connection to transit; improves McLoughlin	Pro
Testimony	Slack, Don	Oregon City Transportation Advisory Committee	Oregon City	BD5134	McLoughlin Blvd: Clackamas River-Dunes Dr	Crucial arterial that will stimulate development.	Pro
Letter	Grozniak, Frank	City of Lake Oswego	Lake Oswego	BD6127	Boones Ferry Rd: Red Cedar Way to S of Reese Rd	Will catalyze development of Lake Grove as a Village Center	Pro
Letter	McNulty, Wilma	Resident, Lake Oswego	Lake Oswego	BD6127	Boones Ferry Rd: Red Cedar Way to S of Reese Rd	Will address serious safety issue	Pro
Testimony	Barber, Bill	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Supports project	Pro
Testimony	Coe, MJ	Sullivan's Gulch Corridor Trail Steering Committee	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	17 neighborhood associations support this project; community groups have contributed \$8,100 already.	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Testimony	Coward, Lynn	Sullivan's Gulch Land Use Committee	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Trail will add much needed alternative and will support density goals	Pro
Testimony	Everhart, Gregg	Portland Parks & Rec	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Supports project	Pro
Testimony	Hathaway-Marxer, Susan	Irvington Neighborhood	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Offers connectivity, serves employment areas; many benefits	Pro
Testimony	Kyle, Guy	Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Assn	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Provides needed connection to tother neighborhoods, business districts	Pro
Letter	Larson, John	Holladay Park Plaza	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Supports walking by residents of the plaza	Pro
Testimony	Perkins, Brad	None specified	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Needed connectivity for alternative transportation	Pro
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK0001	Sullivan's Gulch Trail: Esplanade to 122nd Ave	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Testimony	Balcom, Clarke	40-mile Loop Land Trust	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Need to connect bikes trails to streetcar	Pro
Email	Brown, Bruce	GBD Architects	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Fixing gap in loop train would benefit the whole area; area is growing	Pro
Letter	Bruun, Mark	Lorentz Bruun Co., Inc.	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Fixing gap in loop train would benefit the whole area; area is growing	Pro
Testimony	Chun, Norman	Resident So. Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Heavy bicycle used for commuting and recreation	Pro
Email	Clark, Patrick	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Fixing gap in loop trail would benefit the whole area; area is growing	Pro
Postcard	Curry, Robert	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Legacy for future generations	Pro
Testimony	Everhart, Gregg	Portland Parks & Rec	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Was supposed to be funded, but money went to the streetcar; fills gap	Pro
Email	Fenner, Peter	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed amenity in fast-growing area	Pro
Email	Garcia, Theresa	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Extension would provide safer option for bicyclists and pedestrians	Pro
Postcard	Hall, Kirsty	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Supports the project.	Pro
Email	Kitzhaber, Sharon	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Fixing gap in loop trail would benefit the whole area; area is growing	Pro
Testimony	Kwok, Joan	Resident So. Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed amenity in fast-growing area	Pro
Postcard	Linvog, Erik	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Trail needed for bike and pedestrian safety as population and use in that area grows	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positive
Postcard	Luke, Jim	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Trail needed for bike and pedestrian safety as population and use in that area grows	Pro
Testimony	Luke, Jim (with 101 signed supporters)	Resident So. Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Growth in residents and employment has brought huge increase in bicycle use to the area (Supported by 101 additional signatures)	Pro
Email	Mathieson, Adrian	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Fixing gap in loop trail would benefit the whole area	Pro
Testimony	Mendoza Gray, Steffeni	Portland Parks Board	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	MTIP funds are crucial to fixing the gap in the trail	Pro
Petition	Meriwether residents	SW Waterfront residents	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed to make safe connection for bikes and pedestrians	Pro
Postcard	Newlevant, Jack	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Will be a useful link in the system	Pro
Email	Panoff, Krista	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed to make safe connection for bikes and pedestrians	Pro
Postcard	Panoff, Krista	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed for safety from large construction vehicles	Pro
Testimony	Peterson, Nicole	Williams&Dame Development, Inc	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Critical connection to trail system to the south in a fast-developing area	Pro
Postcard	Rehberg, Shayna	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Maximizes investments in the district; creates needed connection	Pro
Testimony	Sallinger, Bob	Audubon Society of Portland	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Critical connection to trail system to the south in a fast-developing area	Pro
Testimony	Santner, Zari	Portland Parks & Rec	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Project serves a growing population, restores connectivity where construction has created a hazard	Pro
Web	Schlitt, Donna	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Trail is crucial part of the greenway	Pro
Letter	Shafer, Kelly	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Centerpiece of life in the area and for downtown	Pro
Letter	Shafer, Mark	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed to get around construction in area	Pro
Email	Smith, Chris	None specified	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Should have been funded out of earlier \$10 M MTIP; important trail connection for multi-modal system	Pro
Letter	Stout, Mei	40-mile Loop Land Trust	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Critical connection to trail system to the south in a fast-developing area	Pro
Email	Weijo, Rick & Sharon	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Growing area needs this resource	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positive
Email	White, Anna & Rollie	Resident, S Waterfront	Portland	BK1048	Willamette Greenway Trail: SW Gibbs-SW Lowell	Needed to make safe connection for bikes and pedestrians	Pro
Testimony	Parker, Terry	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK1126	NE-SE 50s Bikeway:NE Thompson-SE Woodstock	Opposes project	Con
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK1126	NE-SE 50s Bikeway:NE Thompson-SE Woodstock	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK1999	NE-SE 70s Bikeway:NE Killingsworth-SE Clatsop	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Testimony	Ordal, Mary	Hillsboro Parks & Rec	Hillsboro	BK3012	Rock Creek Path: Orchard Park-NW Wilkins	Provides connectivity, safety, and quality of life	Pro
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK3012	Rock Creek Path: Orchard Park-NW Wilkins	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Testimony	Kroger, Wendy	Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec	Beaverton	BK3014	Westside Corridor Trail: Tualatin to Willametter Rivers	Fills gaps, provides alternative to car travel, important amenity	Pro
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK3014	Westside Corridor Trail: Tualatin to Willametter Rivers	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Testimony	Schouten, Dick	Washington County	Washington County	BK3014	Westside Corridor Trail: Tualatin to Willametter Rivers	Fills gaps, important amenity	Pro
Email	Roberts, Jessica	Resident, Portland	Portland	BK5026	Trolley Trail:Arista St-Glen Echo	Bike projects repair gaps in a multi-modal network and are cost-effective	Pro
Testimony	Gardner, Ann	Portland Freight Committee	Portland	FR0001	N Burgard/Lombard: N Columbia Blvd-UPRR Bridge	Will improve freight movement and add bike and pedestrian safety improvement	Pro
Testimony	Mathers, Gob	Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Portland	FR0001	N Burgard/Lombard: N Columbia Blvd-UPRR Bridge	Freight movement essential to the economy; project adds bike and ped facilities and improves freight route	Pro
Testimony	Collier, Corky	Columbia Corridor Assn	Portland	FR0002	Portland Rd/Columbia Blvd	Redirect freight so it doesn't go through the St. Johns neighborhoods	Pro
Testimony	Gardner, Ann	Portland Freight Committee	Portland	FR0002	Portland Rd/Columbia Blvd	Redirect freight so it doesn't go through the St. Johns neighborhoods	Pro
Testimony	Mathers, Gob	Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Portland	FR0002	Portland Rd/Columbia Blvd	Freight movement essential to the economy; project would improve neighborhood safety	Pro
Testimony	Collier, Corky	Columbia Corridor Assn	Portland	FR4044	82nd Ave/Columbia intersection improvements	Will improve freight movement and add bike and pedestrian safety improvement	Pro
Testimony	Gardner, Ann	Portland Freight Committee	Portland	FR4044	82nd Ave/Columbia intersection improvements	Will improve freight movement and add bike and pedestrian safety improvement	Pro
Testimony	Lindsay, Chad	KWE	Portland	FR4044	82nd Ave/Columbia intersection improvements	Would improve access, improve safety, benefit the environment	Pro
Testimony	Mathers, Gob	Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Portland	FR4044	82nd Ave/Columbia intersection improvements	Freight movement essential to the economy; project increases accessibility	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Testimony	Fritz, Barb	Cully Neighborhood	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Badly needed for pedestrian safety	Pro
Testimony	Fuerstenau, Kathy	Cully Association of Neighborhoods	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Low-income area badly in need of pedestrian safety improvements	Pro
Testimony	Gill, Lauren	Cully Neighborhood	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Badly needed for pedestrian safety	Pro
Testimony	Hipolito, Alan	Verde	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Please fund fully: Badly needed for pedestrian safety; environmental, economic benefits	Pro
Testimony	Mancini, April	Cully Neighborhood	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Badly needed for pedestrian safety	Pro
Testimony	Vietzke, Mel	Cully Association of Neighborhoods	Portland	GS1224	Cully Blvd: NE Prescott-NE Killingworth	Area has not had a project in 20 years; badly needs sidewalks, other improvements	Pro
Letter	Shawn, Eric (two cosigners)	Friends of No. Clackamas Park	Milwaukie	GS5049	OR99-E Bridge at Kellogg Lake	Important for fish habitat	Pro
Testimony	Wegener, Brian	Tualatin Riverkeepers	Tigard	GS6050	Main Street: Rail Corridor-99W	Important for water quality improvement; integral with other projects	Pro
Testimony	Laventall, Jess	Lents Neighborhood Assn	Portland	PD1160	Foster-Woodstock: SE 87th-SE101st	Badly needed for pedestrian safety; important to develop Lents Town Center	Pro
Letter	Peek, Cynthia	Lents Town Center URAC	Portland	PD1160	Foster-Woodstock: SE 87th-SE101st	Important for pedestrian safety and to develop the Town Center	Pro
Testimony	Bennett, Mike	City of Gresham	Gresham	PD2057	Hood St: SE Division ST-SE Powell Blvd	Important link between light rail and proposed Center for the Arts	Pro
Testimony	Everett, Kathy	Gresham Downtown Development Assoc.	Region	PD2057	Hood St: SE Division ST-SE Powell Blvd	Fill gap in pedestrian facility, make are ADA compliant, improve connectivity	Pro
Postcard	Hamilton, Alicia	None specified	Milwaukie	PD5052	SE 17th Ave:SE Ochoco-SE Lava Dr.	Key link that would improve bike travel and help revitalize the downtown	Pro
Testimony	Craghead, Alexander	City of Tigard	Tigard	PD6007	Fanno Creek trail: Hall Blvd Crossing Study	Supports project See letter	Pro
Testimony	Kroger, Wendy	Tualatin Hills Parks & Rec	Beaverton	PD6007	Fanno Creek trail: Hall Blvd Crossing Study	Dangerous crossing; heavily used but would be even more heavily used with safe crossing	Pro
Testimony	Schouten, Dick	Washington County	Washington County	PD6007	Fanno Creek trail: Hall Blvd Crossing Study	Crossing needs to be fixed	Pro
Testimony	Cunningham, Mary	Office of Congressman Wu	Beaverton	RC3023	Highway 217:Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy-SW Allen Blvd	Spoke and submitted a letter on behalf of Congressman Wu in support	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Testimony	Schleuter, Jonathan	Westside Economic Alliance	Beaverton	RC3023	Highway 217: Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy-SW Allen Blvd	Needed for freight, road capacity, commuter access; long overdue	Pro
Letter	Wu, David	US Representative, 1st District	Beaverton	RC3023	Highway 217: Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy-SW Allen Blvd	Economic health of Oregon in jeopardy if this project does not proceed	Pro
Letter	Drake, Rob	Mayor, City of Beaverton	Beaverton	RC3030	Farmington Road: SW Murray-SW Hocken	Intersection needs turn lanes, bike lanes; project is ready to proceed	Pro
Testimony	King, Carla	Central Beaverton Neighborhood Assn	Beaverton	RC3030	Farmington Road: SW Murray-SW Hocken	Growing area demands fixes to this road	Pro
Email	McCormick, Rita	Resident	Hillsboro	RC3030	Farmington Road: SW Murray-SW Hocken	No need to improve; use money elsewhere	Con
Testimony	Bennett, Mike	City of Gresham	Gresham	RC7036	SE 190th DR: Pleasant View/Highland-SW 30th St	Supports development of Pleasant Valley, promotes 2040, serves employment centers	Pro
Testimony	Parker, Terry	Resident, Portland	Portland	RR1010	Morrison Bridge: Willamette, River	Support	Pro
Email	Butler, Andy	None specified	Portland	RR1214	Division Street: SE6th-39th St	Please fund; disappointed it was not recommended in final draft list	Pro
Testimony	Nettekoven, Linda	HAND/DCBA	Portland	RR1214	Division Street: SE6th-39th St	Necessary to pave Division before other projects can proceed	Pro
Web	Pearce, Susan	HAND	Portland	RR1214	Division Street: SE6th-39th St	Increasing traffic creates congestion and safety hazards	
Letter	Brown, Kerry	None specified	Portland	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Supports project	Pro
Letter	Colleen, Carol	Fairview resident	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Crucial for improving safety	Pro
Testimony	Collier, Corky	Columbia Corridor Assn	Portland	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Badly needed to improve safety for all modes.	Pro
Testimony	Cooper, Larry	City of Fairview	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Fix key safety issues (Spoke on behalf of Mike Weatherly, Mayor of Fairview)	Pro
Letter	Davis, Phyllis	Resident, Fairview	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Badly overdue to fix serious safety issue	Pro
Testimony	Johnson, Ken	Chief of Police, City of Fairview	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Extremely dangerous for bikes and pedestrians; site of many crashes	Pro
Letter	Townsend, Jeff	Townsend Farms	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Improvements will support economic development and improve safety	Pro
Testimony	Vonderharr, Roger	West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Fix a dangerous area; promote economic development	Pro
Letter	Weatherby, Mike	Mayor, City of Fairview	Fairview	RR2081	223rd RR undercrossing at Sandy Blvd	Key to safety and access improvement	Pro

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Position
Testimony	Boxer, Charlotte	Pacific Continental Bank	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Mixed use developments benefit the region; these programs make it possible for private investors to proceed.	Pro
Letter	Bruning, Fred	Centercal Properties	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Catalyst for private investment in high-density, mixed use areas	Pro
Testimony	Ellsworth, Mark	Office of the Governor, Salem	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Essential to 30 projects in the region	Pro
Testimony	Everett, Kathy	Gresham Downtown Development Assoc.	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Demonstrated success in creating mixed-use centers and private investment	Pro
Testimony	Gallagher, Ed	City of Gresham	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Important to stimulate private investment	Pro
Testimony	Kemper, Tom	None specified	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Had been instrumental in two projects he developed; important to spur infill	Pro
Testimony	Laramee, Brian	Myhre Group Architects	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Creates awareness, nurtures growth	Pro
Testimony	McNamara, Ed	Turtle Island Development, LLC	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Important to leverage private investment	Pro
Letter	Norquist, Jerry	Cycle Oregon	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Project has demonstrated its use in encouraging alternate transportation modes	Pro
Testimony	Southgate, John	City of Hillsboro	Region	TD8005a	Metro TOD Implementation Program	Hillsboro is poised to take off; needs this program to help	Pro
Letter	Bernard, James	Mayor, City of Milwaukie	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Crucial for private-public partnerships that make centers happen	Pro
Letter	Bruning, Fred	Centercal Properties	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Catalyst for private investment in high-density, mixed use areas	Pro
Testimony	Gallagher, Ed	City of Gresham	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Important to stimulate private investment	Pro
Testimony	Laramee, Brian	Myhre Group Architects	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Encourages alternative transportation; window-shopping, gathering places	Pro
Letter	Norquist, Jerry	Cycle Oregon	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Project has demonstrated its use in encouraging alternate transportation modes	Pro
Testimony	Russman, Mike	Peak Development, LLC	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	TOD contributes crucial funding, without which these projects can't be built	Pro
Testimony	Southgate, John	City of Hillsboro	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Hillsboro is poised to take off; needs this program to help	Pro
Testimony	Swanson, Mike	City of Milwaukie	Region	TD8005b	Metro Centers Implementation Program	Crucial for stimulating redevelopment and development of centers	Pro
Testimony	Parker, Terry	None specified	Portland	TD8025	Hollywood Transit Center: NE Halsey/NE 42nd St	Oppose	Con

Type	Name	Affiliation	Location	ID	Project description	Comment	Positic
Letter	White, Dana	Providence Health System	Portland	TD8025	Hollywood Transit Center: NE Halsey/NE 42nd St	Needed for safety and to support transit ridership	Pro
Testimony	Barber, Bill	Resident, Portland	Region	TO8052	Regional Travel Options	RTO projects promote use of many alternatives to SOV travel	Pro
Testimony	Everett, Kathy	Gresham Downtown Development Assoc.	Region	TO8052	Regional Travel Options	Enables partnerships crucial to developing successful centers	Pro
Testimony	Frost, Karen	Westside Transportation Alliance	Region	TO8052	Regional Travel Options	Funds crucial educational component of efforts to reduce car dependency	Pro
Testimony	Barber, Bill	Resident, Portland	Region	TO8053	RTO Individualized marketing program	Supports project	Pro
Testimony	Frost, Karen	Westside Transportation Alliance	Region	TO8053	RTO Individualized marketing program	Allows TMAs to educate people on alternatives to SOV trips	
Testimony	Wiley, Alison	Westside Transportation Alliance	Region	TO8053	RTO Individualized marketing program	Urgent in the face of population growth and roads at capacity now	Pro
Testimony	Anderson, Lenny	Swan Island TMA	Region	TO8056	RTO new TMA Support	Necessary to achieve 2040 goal of reducing SOV use	Pro
Testimony	Barber, Bill	Resident, Portland	Region	TO8056	RTO new TMA Support	Supports project	Pro
Testimony	Burns, Sandi	Clackamas Regional TMA	Region	TO8056	RTO new TMA Support	Program supports TMA that provide crucial information to employers on transit and other mobility options	Pro
Testimony	Everett, Kathy	Gresham Downtown Development Assoc.	Region	TO8056	RTO new TMA Support	Enables partnerships crucial to developing successful centers	Pro
Testimony	Perkins, Brad	None specified	Portland	TR1106	Portland Streetcar: NW 10th-39th St	Supports project	Pro
Letter	Brown, Kerry	None specified	Portland	No #	Trails projects in SW Portland	Supports all trails in SW Portland	Pro
Letter	Olsen, John W	Phagan's Schools NW, Inc	Portland	No #	General	Need light rail service in Tigard	Pro
Letter	Thayer, Jim	SW Hills Residential League	Portland	No #	General	Need safe bike and pedestrian facilities in SW Portland	Pro