600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793

METRO

Agenda

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION
DATE: September 25, 2007
DAY: Tuesday
TIME: 2:00 PM
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2:00 PM	**1.**	**DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 27, 2007/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS**	
2:15 PM	**2.**	**EXPLORATION AND FRAMING OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION AND NATURAL AREAS MAINTENANCE BALLOT MEASURE PROJECT UPDATE**	Burkholder
2:45 PM	**3.**	**METRO HOTLINE IMPLEMENTATION**	Flynn
3:15 PM	**4.**	**BREAK**	
3:20 PM	**5.**	**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE I-5/HIGHWAY 99W CONNECTOR**	Hosticka/ Turpel
4:20 PM	**6.**	**COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION**	

ADJOURN

Agenda Item Number 2.0

EXPLORATION AND FRAMING OF CONSERVATION EDUCATION AND NATURAL AREAS MAINTENANCE BALLOT MEASURE PROJECT UPDATE

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, September 25, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: 9/25/07 Time: Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Exploration and framing of conservation education and natural areas maintenance ballot measure project update

Department: Council

Presenters: Rex Burkholder

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Residents of the Portland region own some of the most remarkable urban natural areas and parkland in the world. Yet a majority of this land is ecologically threatened, under-maintained for recreational use, or inaccessible to the public. Not only do we need to directly address these issues, but we also need to educate and invite Metro area residents to act as stewards for our region's wealth of natural resources. Outdoor school has traditionally been Oregon's way of introducing children to the joys and science of nature. Currently, many Metro area school districts cannot afford to send their students to outdoor school, and even those that can are struggling to find sources of funding for the program. Furthermore, many parks and natural areas lack sufficient educational programs and activities to engage and educate the people they serve.

The 2006 Natural Areas bond measure that expanded our system of parks and greenspaces was an important victory, but not the end of the story. Now we must ensure that our region's natural areas have adequate funds, as well as a public that is engaged in conservation issues, to properly care for them.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

No action on options is required.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Council approved the Council Project exploring and framing of conservation education and natural areas maintenance ballot measure. The purpose of this work session is to provide a project update.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Does Council have any additional feedback on the progress of this project?

Does Council have any feedback on the proposed work of the consultant team?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes _x_ No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED ___Yes x No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval _____
Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

Agenda Item Number 3.0

METRO HOTLINE IMPMEMENTATION

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, September 25, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: September 25, 2007 Time: 2:45pm Length: 15 minutes

Presentation Title: Progress on Metro Hotline Implementation

Department: Metro Auditor

Presenters: Suzanne Flynn

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

The Office of the Metro Auditor was approved in the FY07-08 budget to implement a fraud hotline for Metro. The Auditor has worked with representatives from Human Resources, Procurement and Contracting, Office of the Metro Attorney, Information Technology and Finance, and the COO to tentatively decide upon a hotline design and choose a vendor. A team of representatives of the above departments reviewed hotline proposals and recommended EthicsPoint, a locally based vendor, to provide the service.

The reporting system is web-based but also includes a call center component. These two methods of reporting are linked in a case management system also supported by the vendor.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

During implementation, processes will have to be developed and decisions made as to who at Metro is appropriate to take the lead when investigating the different types of reports. At this time the procedures are not finalized. The hotline will take about eight weeks to implement from the point the contract is signed. The last few weeks will be an internal test of the system.

The contract includes design of a separate landing page with a unique URL. That name needs to be decided upon. The software can generate reports in the aggregate and over time that management and/or Council can use to identify areas for improvement. The contract also includes access to materials to advertise the hotline such as business cards, placards, and brochures.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

It is the Auditor's intent to work with the same management group to formalize what can be reported on the hotline and the procedures that will be followed. The Auditor will ask for the assistance of public affairs to develop a communication plan.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Would the Council like to be involved during the testing period?
Would the Council like to have annual or periodic reports after the hotline is active?
Does the Council have any suggestions for a hotline name or potential procedures?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes X No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED ___Yes ___No

Task Summary Task Milestone

EthicsPoint Implementation Project Plan

METRO - Oregon		Week 1					Week 2					Week 3					Week 4					Week 5					Week 6					Week 7					Week 8				
Implementation Task	**Duration**	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F
CPE Introduction	**5 days**																																							
Intro Call and Project Overview	1 day																																							
UID and PW Email	0 days																																							
Training 1	4 days																																							
Issue Categories	**20 days**																																							
Identify Categories and Order	2 days																																							
Customize Text and Questions	20 days																																							
Post Issue Categories	0 days																																							
Landing Page (GUI) Design	**35 days**																																							
Define Organizational Hierarchy	5 days																																							
Identify Links and Redirects	5 days																																							
Customize Page Design	30 days																																							
Post English Page(s) for Review	0 days																																							
Identify Translation Requirements	1 day																																							
Translation (As Needed)	10 days																																							
Post Translated Pages For Review	0 days																																							
EP Helpline 800-Number	**25 days**																																							
Confirm 866-ETHICSP, Transfer, or Unique #	1 day																																							
Acquire Unique 800 Number	1 day																																							
Transfer Existing 800-Number (if required)*	15 days																																							
Provision for AT&T Direct (if required)*	10 days																																							
Test Numbers and Provisioning	5 days																																							
Call Center Procedures	**15 days**																																							
Identify Redirects, Referrals, and Directives	10 days																																							
Update Pop-Ups and Docs	5 days																																							
Client Administration	**30 days**																																							
Stakeholder Awareness	30 days																																							
Identify Report Recipients	5 days																																							
Enter Report Recipients	2 days																																							
Training 2 (As Needed)	10 days																																							
Testing	**25 days**																																							
Testing GUI Flow & Reporting Function	25 days																																							
Confirm Issue Text & Questions	10 days																																							
EthicsPoint Go Live!	**0 days**																																							

* Denotes item where time frames are telco carrier dependent. Time frames defined reflect average turnaround.

Agenda Item Number 5.0

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE I-5/HWY 99 CONNECTOR

Metro Council Work Session
Tuesday, September 25, 2007
Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: September 25, 2007 Time: 3:20 pm Length: 1 hour

Presentation Title: I-5/Highway 99W – Draft Evaluation Criteria

Department: Planning

Presenters: Carl Hosticka, Andy Cotugno, Mark Turpel

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

The issue is whether the proposed Evaluation Criteria for the I-5/Highway 99W Connector are sufficient to address Metro Council policy questions.

The I-5/Highway 99W Connector is included in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), but the location is not specified and an alternatives analysis is now being conducted that is intended to result in an amendment of the RTP.

On August 7, the Metro Council held a work session reviewing the Range of Alternatives (ROA):

1) No-Build;
2) Transportation System Management/Transportation Demand Management;
3) Expanded Existing System Alternative;
4) Expressway or Parkway inside the urban growth boundary and
5) Expressway or Parkway outside the urban growth boundary.

[On August 22, the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which is comprised of elected officials from the project area, including Metro Councilor Hosticka and representatives of ODOT and Federal Highway Administration, approved the ROA.]

At the August Metro work session, several Metro Councilors asked that the draft Evaluation Criteria, when available, be brought forward for review and comment.

The draft Evaluation Criteria are structured based on the following adopted Project goals:

- Goal 1 – Provide transportation improvements that address present and future demand for travel to and between I-5 and 99W in the Tualatin/Sherwood/ Wilsonville area;
- Goal 2 – Provide transportation improvements that support state, regional and local land use planning;
- Goal 3 – Provide transportation improvements that avoid where possible, then minimize and effectively mitigate, adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources; and,
- Goal 4 – Provide a timely and cost-effective project solution that performs as designed throughout its expected design-life.

Within each Project goal, more detailed Project objectives, also adopted by the PSC, are used to more specifically structure the draft Evaluation Criteria. Project goals, objectives and the proposed Evaluation Criteria are all included in the attached document.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

The following options are available to the Metro Council when establishing policy guidance:

Option 1) the Metro Council could conclude that the draft Evaluation Criteria are sufficient to address the policy issues it wishes to see addressed by the Project;

Option 2) the Metro Council could make recommendations for revisions or additions to the draft Evaluation Criteria; or,

Option 3) the Metro Council could exercise Option 2 and, if the PSC does not take action on September 26, staff could provide a summary of both PSC discussion and public comments and the Metro Council could review these comments and determine whether further Metro Council recommendations are warranted.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Being clear about how the alternatives will be evaluated prior to the evaluation helps ensure that the decision process is transparent. Accordingly, the Project has prepared proposed evaluation criteria now, as the Range of Alternatives has been selected, but evaluation has not yet commenced.

If the Metro Council has concerns about possible Project impacts and concludes that the draft Evaluation Criteria do not address these possible impacts, these may be conveyed to the PSC.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Does the Metro Council wish to recommend revisions or additions to the proposed Evaluation Criteria?

If so, what revisions or additions should be made?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes X_No
DRAFT IS ATTACHED ___Yes _X_No

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis

(not in order of priority)

Goal 1 – Provide transportation improvements that address present and future demand for travel to and between I-5 and 99W in the Tualatin/Sherwood/Wilsonville area		
Objectives	**Evaluation Criteria (basis of analysis for each objective)**	**Evaluation Measures (units of measure for each criterion)**
Objective 1A – Reduce the growing problem of congestion in the designated Town Centers of Tualatin, Sherwood, Wilsonville and Tigard caused by regional, through and interstate trips conflicting with local access and circulation.	**To address Objective 1A, each alternative will be evaluated to determine how much:** • **Congestion will occur on major roadway and intersections in the town centers;** • **Motor vehicle volume/demand/use will occur within town centers** • **Truck traffic will occur within the town centers (also relates to Objective 1E).**	1. Through, regional and local traffic volumes distinguished between trucks and other vehicle classifications for selected roadway segments listed above (Plots of study area network displaying changes) 2. Roadway segments that are above standard volume/capacity (v/c) ratio in the 2030 PM peak hour (plots of study area major roadway network with v/c ratio by selected segment for each alternative) 3. Demand-to-capacity ratios for selected roadway segments in the 2030 PM peak hour: • 99W south of Brookman Rd • 99W south of Tualatin-Sherwood Rd • 99W north of Tualatin-Sherwood Rd • 99W north of 124th Ave • 99W north of Main/Johnson St • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd east of 99W • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd west of 124th • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd west of Boones Ferry Rd • Wilsonville Road west of Town Center Loop West • Connector east of 99W (where applicable) • Connector west of I-5 (where applicable) 4. Level of service, delay and demand-to-capacity ratios for the 2030 PM peak hour at selected intersections: • 99W at Tualatin-Sherwood Rd • 99W at Edy Road/Sherwood Blvd • 99W at Sunset Blvd • OR/99W at 124th Ave • 99W at Durham Rd • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd at Oregon St • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd at Boones Ferry Rd • I-5 at Carmen Dr Ramps • I-5 at Nyberg Rd Ramps • I-5 at Elligsen Rd Ramps • I-5 at Wilsonville Rd Ramps Note: Person and vehicle trips are addressed under Measure 1C.

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Objective 1B – Improve the "gateway" access for regional and intrastate trips on 99W and I-5 accessing the greater Portland metropolitan area.	**To address Objective 1B, each alternative will be evaluated to determine how:** • **I-5 and 99W maintain accessibility to the Portland metropolitan area for regional and through traffic;** • **Travel times improve/worsen for key origins and destinations** • **Travel delay improves/worsens for the study area transportation system.**	1. Travel times between key origins and destinations: • I-5/99W junction to/from 99W south of Brookman via 99W, Durham, Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Tonquin, Connector (where applicable) • I-205/Stafford Rd to/from 99W south of Brookman via Durham, Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Tonquin, Connector (where applicable) • Downtown Sherwood to nearest connector access point (where applicable) 2. Vehicle hours of delay (summarized graphically by transportation analysis zone in study area) 3. Lane miles of delay (study area summation)
Objective 1C – Provide transportation improvements that are safe and effectively serve all travel modes including bicycles, pedestrians, transit, and motor-vehicles (including trucks).	**To address Objective 1C, each alternative will:** • **Identify by percentage mode use (vehicle, transit, pedestrian, and bike) in the study area;** • **Estimate the number of potential crashes;** • **Assess mobility and access for pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and motor vehicles.**	1. Transit ridership on key transit routes 2. Number of vehicle trips in study area 3. Number of person trips in study area 4. Safety assessment: • Typical crash rates compared with demand on key project area roadways (99W, Tualatin-Sherwood Road, I-5 and Connector, where applicable) • Typical crash rates compared with demand on historically rural roads (Baker Rd, Bell Rd, Tonquin Rd, Grahams Ferry Rd) 5. Qualitative discussion of access management conformity to applicable spacing standards on 99W, Tualatin-Sherwood Rd, I-5 and Connector (where applicable) 6. Qualitative comparison of bicycle/pedestrian network improvements
Objective 1D –Provide transportation improvements that will not negatively impact I-5, between the Nyberg/I-5 interchange and the Boone Bridge at the Willamette River, and 99W.	**To address Objective 1D, each alternative will be evaluated by determining freeway performance on I-5 and 99W.**	1. Analysis of I-5 from Carman Dr to Miley Rd and I-205 from I-5 to Stafford Rd: • Identify average speeds, densities, and v/c ratios on freeway segments • Identify substandard weaving and junction sections 2. Analysis of 99W from Durham Rd to Bell Rd: • Identify average arterials speeds and v/c ratios on segments and intersections (see Objective 1A for v/c ratio locations) • Identify weaving and junction issues with Connector Interchange (where applicable)

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Objective 1E – Provide for the access and regional and intrastate travel needs of trucks hauling freight into and out of the Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville areas.	**To address Objective 1E, each alternative will be evaluated by:** • **Identifying roadways utilized by different classes of trucks to compare truck volumes and access needs; and** • **Identifying truck travel times.**	Evaluation for Objective 1B will be used to identify: 1. All truck classes on major study area roads in 2030 PM peak hour (map plot); 2. Differences in truck volumes compared to 2030 PM peak hour No-Build option (map plot); 3. Travel times for truck and other trips to/from the following industrial points (plot of travel time contours): • Tualatin industrial area to/from north I-5, south I-5, I-205 • Wilsonville industrial area to/from north I-5, south I-5, I-205 • Sherwood industrial area to/from north I-5, south I-5, I-205
Objective 1F – Provide multimodal transportation improvements that complement and support local transportation systems planning.	**To address Objective 1F, each alternative will be evaluated by:** • **Identifying proposed improvements in transportation systems** • **Identifying the differences between the proposed improvements in the alternative and the transportation system plans and identifying potential conflicts.**	This analysis will compare each alternative to applicable adopted local, regional and state transportation plans; and applicable planning policies and actions of these entities. Improvements that are not consistent with adopted plans and planning will be discussed to determine if they could be modified to be complement planning, or if the jurisdiction(s) would need to modify their adopted plans to accommodate the proposed action.
Objective 1G – Provide for enhanced emergency vehicle response time and access needs, and needs identified from regional and state evacuation route planning.	**To address Objective 1G, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying emergency response performance.**	Combined with the transportation system travel time analysis in Objective 1B, this evaluation will be done by providing the Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue District information necessary to complete its own modeling of emergency response times, and utilizing Tualatin Valley Fire &Rescue's response time modeling to evaluate response performance.
Objective 1H – Provide expanded transportation facilities capacity within the project area.	**No additional evaluation criteria are necessary to evaluate Objective 1H. Information collected for evaluating Objective 1A will be used to address Objective 1H.**	The change in transportation system capacity will be analyzed with the congestion analysis under Objective 1A.

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Goal 2 – Provide transportation improvements that support state, regional, and local land use planning.		
Objectives	**Evaluation Criteria (basis of analysis for each objective)**	**Evaluation Measures (units of measure for each criterion)**
Objective 2A – Fully investigate and consider potential transportation solutions that avoid having to take state land use goal exceptions.	**To address Objective 2A, each alternative will be evaluated against performance and feasibility thresholds. If alternatives located inside the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) meet these thresholds, a new transportation facility located outside the UGB may only be eligible for selection if the UGB is amended to encompass it.**	Determination of each alternative's ability to meet the following Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) performance thresholds: • Transportation improvements can serve their intended functions and are consistent with management objectives for the type(s) of facility proposed as described in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) or other applicable transportation system plans. • ~~Transportation improvements are consistent with adopted OHP, regional or local highway performance standards as applicable for the type(s) of facility proposed~~[CSR1]~~.~~ • Transportation improvements can meet applicable engineering and design standards for the type(s) of facility proposed. • Transportation improvements do not have an unduly adverse impact on town centers, as measured by their ability to meet town center planning objectives and design standards in Metro's 2040 Plan. • Transportation improvements avoid Section 4(f) resources, including the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge. • The costs of the transportation improvements not requiring a goal exception do not significantly exceed the costs of ~~other~~ alternatives that do require an exception~~can reasonably accommodate the identified transportation need~~. • The transportation improvements not requiring a goal exception do not significantly impact residential and commercial displacements more than ~~other~~ alternatives that do require an exception.~~can accommodate the identified transportation need~~ Note: Other evaluation criteria will inform these thresholds. The TPR calls for setting thresholds for operational feasibility, cost, and economic dislocation. Local governments may also set thresholds for other relevant factors. Identification of what is "significant" in terms of cost and displacements between non-exception and exception alternatives will be determined when the alternatives analysis is completed and prior to selecting the preferred alternative.

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Objective 2B – Protect the viability of regionally-designated Town Centers by avoiding and minimizing impacts where practicable. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide mitigation as appropriate.	**To address Objective 2B, each alternative will be evaluated by:** • **Describing potential traffic-related impacts to town centers (not addressed in Goal 1);** • **Assessing the potential impacts, in general terms, to parking, access, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and economic viability within the town centers;** • **Identifying as a range the number of potential accesses that may be closed or modified; and** • **Identifying potential applicable mitigation strategies.**	1. Identify the change in average daily traffic of through /regional traffic that travels through the town centers by alternative. 2. Measure and compare traffic destined for town centers. 3. Qualitative discussion of potential impacts to traffic access, parking, and circulation as it relates to the town centers. 4. 2030 PM peak hour demand, PM peak period traffic composition, number of travel lanes, need for additional right-of-way, and change in access spacing for the following roadway segments: • 99W south of Tualatin-Sherwood Rd • 99W north of Tualatin-Sherwood Rd • 99W north of Main/Johnson St • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd east of 99W • Tualatin-Sherwood Rd west of Boones Ferry Rd • Wilsonville Road west of Town Center Loop West 5. Travel times for trips to/from the following town center points (plot of travel time contours): • Sherwood (6 corners) • Tualatin (Tualatin-Sherwood–Boones Ferry Road) • Wilsonville (Wilsonville Rd/Town Center Loop West) • Tigard (99W/Main-Johnson) 6. Qualitative discussion of impacts to pedestrian and bicycle travel 7. Qualitative discussion of the developability within town centers 8. Assessment, by alternative, of potentially closed or modified accesses of area businesses reported in a range (number) of accesses affected in the following areas: • Sherwood Town Center • Tualatin Town Center • I-5/99W interchange area west of I-5 9. Discussion of potential mitigation measures Notes: Relevant information from evaluation under Objectives 1A and 1B will inform this evaluation. Specific impacts such as impacts to individual businesses will not be identified at this level of corridor planning

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Objective 2C – Protect the livability, quality, and integrity of established residences and communities by avoiding and minimizing impacts where practicable. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide mitigation as appropriate.	**To address Objectives 2C, 2D and 2E, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying:** • **A range of residential and commercial property displacements;** • **General impacts to vacant land;** • **General effects upon community connectivity;** • **General noise, air quality, energy, noise, geologic, hazardous materials, parks, and visual-related effects;** • **Regional and general localized assessment of air quality effects; and** • **Loss of area or functional value of farm and forest lands, wildlife refuges, parks, and other protected rural land uses.**	1. Range (number) of potentially affected residential properties. (measured two ways – number of displacements and cumulative tax assessor value of displacements) 2. Qualitative comparison of residential and community impacts such as, noise, air quality, community cohesion, visual impacts, and energy. 3. Estimate of acres (range) of displaced vacant land by Metro identified general land use zone. Impacts will be determined using an estimated cross-section of the roadway improvements and its relation to the surrounding zoning. For improvements along existing roads, the impacts will be estimated only where additional right of way might need to be acquired. 4. Number (range) of businesses potentially affected. (measured two ways – number of displacements and cumulative tax assessor value of displacements) 5. Estimate of acres of displaced vacant land by general land use zone (range) 6. Range (in acres) of land under each resource category not already covered under Goal 3 converted to transportation use. These include: • Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) land • Forest land 7. Evaluating community impacts will be a qualitative discussion in how an alternative affects the connectivity of a community. Impacts such as air, noise etc. and energy are more regionally oriented and will generally correlate with other transportation analysis results. Note: Objective 2A will also inform this discussion
Objective 2D – Protect the economic viability of established commercial areas by avoiding and minimizing impacts where practicable. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide mitigation as appropriate.		
Objective 2E – Protect by avoiding, or minimizing impacts to designated "Farm and Forest Lands," wildlife refuges, parks, and other protected areas where practicable. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide mitigation as appropriate.		
Objective 2F – Avoid disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income communities.	**To address Objective 2F, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying potentially affected low-income and minority communities.**	Discussion of potential impacts to minority and low income communities described as having a high/medium/or low potential of affecting low-income and minority populations. Because census data geography does not identify specific residences, a discussion of each alternative's probability (low, medium, or high) to affect low-income and minority residences within block/block group, and census tracts (depending on data availability) areas will be completed.

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Goal 3 – Provide transportation improvements that avoid where possible then minimize and effectively mitigate adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources.		
Objectives	**Evaluation Criteria (basis of analysis for each objective)**	**Evaluation Measures (units of measure for each criterion)**
Objective 3A – Protect habitat systems including forested uplands, wildlife corridors, streams and water bodies, riparian zones, and wetlands. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide effective mitigation.	**To address Objective 3A, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying approximate area of potential impacts by resource type.**	1. Discussion of potential effects to identified habitat systems under each alternative 2. Range (in acres) of potentially impacted: • Wetlands • Riparian zones • Upland habitats and wildlife corridors 3. Approximate area (in acres) of mitigation required: • Wetlands • Riparian zones • Upland habitats and wildlife corridors
Objective 3B – Avoid impacting cultural sites and resources where practicable. Where impacts are unavoidable, provide recordation, salvage, and/or mitigation as appropriate.	**To address Objective 3B, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying cultural resources, the potential for project effects on the resources and applicable mitigation.**	Number (range) of potentially affected sites for each alternative for the following categories (based on existing records search and site visits): • National Register historic within corridors • National Register Eligible sites within corridors • Goal 5 historic areas within corridor • Archaeological sites within corridor
Objective 3C – Avoid impacting the functional wildlife values of lands within the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge, including those lands authorized by Congress for future acquisition.	**To address Objective 3C, each alternative will be evaluated by addressing connectivity within and between portions of the Refuge and could also include a discussion of the evaluation of Objectives 3A and 3D.**	1. Qualitative discussion of each alternative's effects on functional values of the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge. 2. Acres (range) of actual refuge and acquisition area that could be affected.
Objective 3D – Minimize and mitigate adverse impacts to surface and groundwater resources within the project-influence area.	**To address Objective 3D, each alternative will be evaluated by:** • **Calculating the additional impervious surface using an assumed road cross section; and** • **Identifying the potential water quality treatment system options appropriate to the type and location of the improvements.**	1. Estimated amount of impervious surface created (acres) 2. Significant or unique groundwater impacts for each alternative 3. Number of stream crossings 4. Acres of water quality treatment facility required

Adopted Goals and Objectives, and Draft Evaluation Criteria and Measures for Alternatives Analysis (cont'd)

(not in order of priority)

Goal 4 – Provide a timely and cost-effective project solution that performs as designed throughout its expected design-life.		
Objectives	**Evaluation Criteria (basis of analysis for each objective)**	**Evaluation Measures (units of measure for each criterion)**
Objective 4A – Develop a project solution that can be implemented, all or in part, within the next ten years.	• **To address Objective 4A, each alternative will be evaluated by its generalized cost estimate.** • **To address Objective 4B, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying potential funding from various applicable sources.** • **To address Objective 4C, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying potential applicable protective measures.** • **To address Objective 4D, each alternative will be evaluated by identifying any critical issues that may arise in the Alternatives Analysis that could be considered "fatal flaws."**	1. Planning level cost estimates for each alternative using standard per foot construction cost for the type of facility proposed (road, structures etc.). 2. General discussion of phasing potential for each alternative.
Objective 4B – Consider project affordability, sources of funding, and the role of tolling in judging the cost-effectiveness of the project solution.		General information about how various types of projects might be funded.
Objective 4C – Develop measures to protect the operational integrity of the project solution from unintended land use impacts.		This could include land use protection measures such as interchange area management plans, etc.
Objective 4D—As soon as practicable, eliminate potential solutions, including corridors and interchanges, that are clearly infeasible so that project efforts can be focused on the most promising locations and that residents and businesses in the areas that are not suitable for an I-5 to Highway 99W connector can be assured that such a connector will not be further considered.		All other evaluation criteria will inform the evaluation to address Objective 4D.