

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)
Date: Friday, October 30, 2009
Time: 9:30 a.m. to noon
Place: Council Chambers

- | | | | |
|----------|--------|---|---------------------|
| 9:30 AM | 1. | Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum | Ross Roberts, Chair |
| 9:30 AM | 2. | Comments from the Chair and Committee Members | Ross Roberts, Chair |
| 9:35 AM | 3. | Citizen Communications to TPAC on Non-Agenda Items | |
| 9:40 AM | 4. | Future Agenda Items | Ross Roberts, Chair |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MOVES update• On-street Bus Rapid Transit• The State of Travel Models and How to Use Them• ODOT Electric Fleet• Active Transportation update• High Speed Rail• House Bill 2001 (e.g. congestion pricing and climate change scenario planning)• Alternative mobility standards for state facilities in the Metro region | |
| 9:45 AM | 5. * | Approval of TPAC Minutes for September 25, 2009 | Ross Roberts, Chair |
| | 6. | <u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS</u> | |
| 9:50 AM | 6.1 ** | Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Public Comment Report – <u>INFORMATION</u> | Pat Emmerson |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Purpose:</i> Provide an overview of public comment summary report.• <i>Outcome:</i> Ensure understanding of outreach methods and comments received. | |
| 10:05 AM | 6.2 ** | Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – System Analysis – <u>DISCUSSION</u> | Deena Platman |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Purpose:</i> Provide an overview of the system analysis.• <i>Outcome:</i> Ensure understanding of results and progress toward RTP performance targets. | |
| | 7. | <u>ACTION ITEMS</u> | |
| 10:25 AM | 7.1 ** | Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities – <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u> | Deborah Redman |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Purpose:</i> Present Metro staff recommendation on refinement plan priorities.• <i>Outcome:</i> TPAC recommendation to JPACT on technical rankings. | |
| 10:45 AM | 7.2 ** | Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Public Comment Log – <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u> | Kim Ellis |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Purpose:</i> Present Metro staff recommendation on “discussion” items and “consent” items.• <i>Outcome:</i> TPAC recommendation to JPACT on “discussion” items and “consent” items. | |

10:55 AM **7.3** # Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Amending the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Add the SW Moody Avenue Widening and Naito Parkway/River Parkway Intersection Projects and Eliminate the I-5 at North Macadam Access Project – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED

Ted Leybold

- *Purpose:* Present resolution for TPAC recommendation.
- *Outcome:* TPAC recommendation to JPACT on resolution.

12:00 PM **8.** **ADJOURN**

Ross Roberts, Chair

The complete Making the Greatest Place Chief Operating Officer recommendation report, including Regional Transportation Plan documents, may be accessed online at: <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=31389>.

- * Material available electronically.
- ** Materials will be distributed at prior to the meeting.
- # Material will be distributed at the meeting.

*For agenda and schedule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916, e-mail: kelsey.newell@oregonmetro.gov.
To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.*



TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
September 25, 2009
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sorin Garber
Elissa Gertler
Nancy Kraushaar
Alan Lehto
Keith Liden
Mike McKillip
Karen Schilling
April Siebenaler
Paul Smith
Rian Windsheimer
Sharon Zimmerman

AFFILIATION

Citizen
Clackamas County
City of Oregon City, Representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
TriMet
Citizen
City of Tualatin, Representing Cities of Washington Co.
Multnomah County
Citizen
City of Portland
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
Washington Department of Transportation

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mara Gross
John Hoefs
Susie Lahsene
Dean Lookingbill
Dave Nordberg
Luis Ornelas
Ron Papsdorf
John Reinhold
Satvinder Sandhu

AFFILIATION

Citizen
C-TRAN
Port of Portland
SW WA RTC
DEQ
Citizen
City of Gresham
Citizen
FHWA

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Andy Back
Lynda David
Scott King

AFFILIATION

Washington County
SW WA RTC
Port of Portland

STAFF: Robin McArthur, Christina Deffebach, Josh Naramore, Deena Platman, Caleb Winter, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, Amy Rose, Andy Cotugno, Kelsey Newell, Tom Matney.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Robin McArthur declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Rian Windsheimer updated the committee on ODOT's State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). A list of ODOT administered projects was released to JPACT for review at its September 10th meeting. The project list is being incorporated into a draft STIP, for a public comment period beginning in October 2009. After the comments have been collected and taken into account, all ODOT administered projects, transit projects and regional flexible fund projects will be programmed in the Metropolitan TIP and an air quality conformity analysis and findings will be prepared. JPACT and other relevant jurisdictions will vote on adoption of the 2010-13 MTIP, including the ODOT administered projects, in the summer of 2010.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO TPAC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Chair McArthur briefly overviewed future agenda items. Committee members recommended High Speed Rail and status update on House Bill 2001 (e.g. congestion pricing) be added to the list of future agenda items. In addition, members requested that the TPAC and JPACT agendas be reviewed for consistency.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of TPAC Minutes from August 28, 2009

MOTION: Ms. Karen Schilling moved, Mr. Alan Lehto seconded, to adopt the August 28, 2009 meeting minutes.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution No. 09-4069, For the Purpose of Updating the Transportation Planning Public Involvement Policy to Conform to Public Involvement Requirements in the Current Federal Transportation Authorization Act

Ms. Pat Emmerson of Metro presented the draft Public Involvement Policy for Transportation Planning, which conforms to public involvement requirements in the current federal Transportation Authorization Act. Adoption of this resolution would approve the updated

policies, enabling the draft to become the practice in Metro's overall regional transportation planning process.

MOTION: Mr. Paul Smith moved, Ms. Elissa Gertler seconded, to adopt Resolution No. 09-4069.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

6.2 Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Adopting the Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative

Mr. Ron Weinman of Clackamas County provided a presentation on the Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative. The Sunrise Corridor between I-205 and US 26 is a key component of an integrated transportation system that includes short-term and long-term improvements as well as long-range planning to meet projected growth and travel demand in Clackamas County. This project is needed to promote livability, improve freight flow, promote economic development, decrease congestion, and serve areas of expansion and growth. Adoption of this resolution would endorse the full build-out of the Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative, and commits to support funding transportation projects within the Sunrise Project.

The presentation covered the following issues:

- What the sunrise project is today;
- Forecast population and employment growth, 2005-2030;
- 2030 Without the Sunrise;
- Committees Recommend Preferred Alternative;
- Change in Travel Demand;
- Additional Preferred Alternative Elements;
- Overall Environmental Findings;
- Project Cost and Funding;
- The project will need to be phased;
- PRC Agreed Menu of Projects for the Near Term (~10 years); and
- Schedule.

During committee discussion, Mr. Keith Liden was concerned that the Sunrise Project remains disconnected from regional aspirations of reducing carbon emissions and overall traffic via the expansion of lanes. Mr. Weinman and Mr. Windsheimer responded that future congestion issues resulting from escalating freight usage necessitates the Sunrise Project improvements, and phasing the project over the course of ten or more years will mitigate residual problems including congestion and rapid growth in the area. Furthermore, committee members discussed the inclusion of bike paths and alternative transportation options within the Sunrise Project.

MOTION: Ms. Elissa Gertler moved, Mr. Windsheimer seconded, to adopt the resolution.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, one opposed (Liden), and two abstained (Lehto and Smith), the motion passed.

7. INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Making the Greatest Place (MGP)

Chief Operating Officer Recommendation on MGG

Chair McArthur provided an overview of the Chief Operating Officer Recommendation on MGP, and articulated the connection between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and other elements of the MGP.

Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Adoption Package

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro provided an overview of the draft 2035 RTP Adoption Package, outlining the timeframe for adopting the RTP.

Draft Prioritization Criteria for Corridor Refinement Plans

Ms. Deborah Redman of Metro briefly overviewed the draft corridor refinement plan prioritization factors. She emphasized that in order to move forward, agreement is needed on the screening factors used to compare and prioritize the relative urgency of planning for future transportation improvements across the region's mobility corridors.

Committee members were asked to review and refine the prioritization factors, which will be used in the process to prioritize the proposed CRP by the end of 2009. The RTP workgroup is scheduled to discuss the refined CRP draft on October 5th.

7.2 ODOT Management Plan for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for 2009

Mr. Marty Anderson of ODOT briefed the committee on the ODOT management plan for America Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. Of the \$100 million dollars to obligate statewide, \$47 million have been obligated, with a deadline of March 1st, 2010. Currently, ODOT is in the process of notifying local agencies on the current status of their projects; emphasizing the importance of having a contingency plan outlining their intent to use all monies received. Unused ARRA funds will be withdrawn from local agencies and reallocated by the Oregon Local Program Committee. In the Metro area, Metro staff will work with ODOT to reallocate unused ARRA funds consistent with the fail-safe strategy adopted by JPACT in May 2009.

7. **ADJOURN**

Chair McArthur adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Matney
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR SEPTEMBER 25, 2009

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
6.2	Draft Resolution	n/a	For the Purpose of Approval of the Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative - I-205 to Rock Creek Junction + Exhibit A	092509t-01
6.2	Staff Report	09/25/09	In Consideration of Resolution No. 09-XXXX	092509t-02
6.2	PowerPoint	09/24/09	Sunrise Project	092509t-03
7.1	Schedule	09/22/09	Making the Greatest Place Fall 2009 Advisory Committee Schedule	092509t-04
7.1	Report	09/15/09	COO Recommendation for Making the Greatest Place	092509t-05
7.1	Schedule	09/25/09	Technical Review Timeline for Addressing Unresolved Issues	092509t-06
7.1	Memo	09/25/09	Draft Corridor Refinement Plan Prioritization Factors	092509t-07
7.2	Memo	09/25/09	ARRA Fail Safe Process	092509t-08
7.3	Handout	n/a	Green Scene	092509t-09

**ARRA Transportation Reporting Summary: Oregon and Metro Region
Through September 30, 2009**

Recipient	Recovery Act Funds Allocated	Recovery Act Funds Obligated	Recovery Act Funds Outlaid	Number of Projects put out to bid	Recovery act funds associated with projects put out to bid	Number of projects under contract	Recovery act funds associated with projects under contract	Number of projects in which work has begun	Recovery act funds associated with projects in which work has begun	Number of projects in which work has been completed	Recovery act funds associated with completed projects	Number of Direct, On-Project Jobs Created or Sustained by Recovery Act Funds	Total Job Hours Created or Sustained by Recovery Act Funds	Total Payroll of Job Hours Created or Sustained by Recovery Act Funds
ODOT (Statewide)	\$310,225,676	\$203,193,395	\$50,290,422	176	\$166,309,443	175	\$166,279,443	169	\$164,228,698	44	\$4,346,728	22,769	467,889	\$15,348,985
ODOT - Transit (Statewide)	\$21,972,418	\$17,551,606	\$611,398	2	\$17,325,653	2	\$13,206,715	2	\$13,206,715	0	\$0	189	12,730	\$392,847
Capital Assistance	\$54,910,293	\$49,108,271	\$16,064,700	28	\$36,701,891	26	\$35,751,891	24	\$45,462,897	3	\$3,146,572	129	230,854	\$12,459,533
TriMet - Fixed Guideway	\$1,125,728	\$1,125,728	\$1,125,728	0	\$0	0	\$0	1	\$1,125,728	1	\$1,125,728	10	20,887	\$1,125,728
City of Wilsonville - SMART Transit	\$709,663	\$709,663	\$0	3	\$625,000	3	\$625,000	3	\$625,000	0	\$0	5	580	\$32,960
Metro - Local Agencies	\$32,680,474	\$7,572,859	\$961,018	26	\$6,202,787	26	\$6,202,787	26	\$6,202,787	3	\$251,978	1,043	16,036	\$497,374

TriMet figures include TriMet ARRA funds and MPO ARRA funds assigned to transit projects administered by TriMet. Metro figures do not include \$5,342,396 of MPO ARRA funding assigned to TriMet for project administration.

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

The complete Making the Greatest Place Chief Operating Officer recommendation report, including Regional Transportation Plan documents, may be accessed online at:

<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=31389>.

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | Agenda **REVISED**

Meeting: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)
Date: Friday, October 30, 2009
Time: 9:30 a.m. to noon
Place: Council Chambers

9:30 AM	1.	Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum	Ross Roberts, Chair
9:30 AM	2.	Comments from the Chair and Committee Members	Ross Roberts, Chair
9:35 AM	3.	Citizen Communications to TPAC on Non-Agenda Items	
9:40 AM	4.	Future Agenda Items	Ross Roberts, Chair
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOVES update • On-street Bus Rapid Transit • The State of Travel Models and How to Use Them • ODOT Electric Fleet • Active Transportation update • High Speed Rail • House Bill 2001 (e.g. congestion pricing and climate change scenario planning) • Alternative mobility standards for state facilities in the Metro region 	
9:45 AM	5. *	Approval of TPAC Minutes for September 25, 2009	Ross Roberts, Chair
	6.	<u>INFORMATION / DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>	
9:50 AM	6.1 **	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Public Comment Report – <u>INFORMATION</u>	Pat Emmerson
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Purpose:</i> Provide an overview of public comment summary report. • <i>Outcome:</i> Ensure understanding of outreach methods and comments received. 	
10:05 AM	6.2 **	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – System Analysis – <u>DISCUSSION</u>	Kim Ellis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Purpose:</i> Provide an overview of the system analysis. • <i>Outcome:</i> Ensure understanding of results and progress toward RTP performance targets. 	
	7.	<u>ACTION ITEMS</u>	
10:25 AM	7.1 **	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments (Exhibits F and G) – <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u>	Kim Ellis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Purpose:</i> Present Metro staff recommendation on “discussion” items and “consent” items. • <i>Outcome:</i> TPAC recommendation to JPACT on “discussion” items and “consent” items. 	
11:55 AM	7.2 #	Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Amending the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to Add the SW Moody Avenue Widening and Naito Parkway/River Parkway Intersection Projects and Eliminate the I-5 at North Macadam Access Project – <u>RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED</u>	Ted Leybold
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Purpose:</i> Present resolution for TPAC recommendation. • <i>Outcome:</i> TPAC recommendation to JPACT on resolution. 	
12 PM	8.	<u>ADJOURN</u>	Ross Roberts, Chair


- * Material available electronically.
- ** Materials will be distributed at prior to the meeting.
- # Material will be distributed at the meeting.

For agenda and schedule information, call Kelsey Newell at 503-797-1916, e-mail: kelsey.newell@oregonmetro.gov.

To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

October 2009
Public comment report



2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Public comment report

October 2009

 **Metro** | *Memo*

Date: October 27, 2009

To: TPAC, MTAC and Interested Parties

From: Deena Platman, Principal Transportation Planner
Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Subject: System analysis of the RTP Investment Strategy

Purpose

On October 30, 2009, Metro staff will brief TPAC on the preliminary analysis performed on the 2035 Federal Priorities and 2035 State Investment Strategy systems. This memorandum provides background information on the system analysis and key performance findings in anticipation of the TPAC presentation and discussion. The memo also summarizes refinements recommended by MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council the week of October 19.

Background

The 2035 RTP implements the 2040 Growth Concept vision for land use, transportation, the economy and the environment. To that end, the 2035 RTP embraces an outcomes-based approach that establishes goals, objectives, performance measures and targets to direct the region in achieving its broad vision. Over the course of the summer, regional partners updated their priority transportation investments for inclusion into the RTP. Their work resulted in an updated 2035 Federal Priorities transportation investment package (\$13.6 billion) and the 2035 RTP Investment Strategy (\$20.9 billion), which includes additional investment priorities if new or expanded revenue sources become available.

Metro then conducted an analysis of each investment package using both the JPACT-endorsed Performance Targets and the RTP system evaluation measures shown in **Attachment 1** to evaluate performance of the each system of investments. **Attachment 2** includes a comparative summary of how the two RTP systems performed relative to the RTP performance targets and the transportation investment scenarios analyzed in 2008. The JPACT-endorsed performance targets were drawn from the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009 (H.R. 2724), which is included as **Attachment 3**, and state goals for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled.

Analysis caveats

When reviewing the findings, it is important to note that in the upcoming year Metro will complete or begin a number of significant advancements in its analytical capabilities including:

- Research that quantifies the user's perception of transit vehicles types and transit stops to enhance assumptions for transit preference – to be completed winter 2010.
- A "visitor" category for travel behavior of out-of-region visitors in the Central City – to be completed winter 2010.
- Conversion to Visum – to be completed winter 2010.

- A parking lot choice model that considers preferences based on distance, transit service, size of facility, and cost – to be completed winter 2010.
- A regional bicycle model – to be completed in 2010.
- The DASH dynamic tour model that is being developed in partnership with Portland State University. The new demand model is tour-based and will be more consistent with actual travel patterns and includes a temporal element to the travel.
- A dynamic traffic assignment model that allows for a mesoscopic analysis of the transportation network to better measure speed, congestion, queuing among other elements at a finer geographic scale than the current macro-level model outputs allow.
- A new travel behavior survey – scheduled to begin in fall 2010.
- Model assumption changes for fuel efficiencies (e.g. CAFÉ standards) and vehicle technologies.
- The development of tools and policies to address Oregon House Bill 2001, which requires Metro to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from light-duty vehicles by January 2012 and adopt one of these scenarios to meet the state reduction target by 2014.

This work is part of ongoing model enhancement activities as well as preparation for climate change scenarios work that is scheduled to begin after the RTP update.

Preliminary findings

The following analysis provides data for the JPACT-endorsed Performance Targets only. The initial results from the travel forecast model indicate mixed progress in achieving regional goals and targets for both investment packages. When considering the findings, it is important to consider that the travel forecast model assumes a substantial increase in population (58 percent), households (52 percent), and employment (74 percent) by 2035. In addition, the regional travel model is not able to forecast data needed for the safety performance target so this information is not being reported as part of this analysis. The safety target will be monitored as part of future RTP updates.

Following is a summary of the key findings and changes to the performance targets as recommended by MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council. Attachment 3 provides the supporting data for reference.

Congestion

The 2035 RTP sets a reduction target for vehicle hours of delay per person at 10 percent below 2005 levels for travel within urban growth boundary. The good news is that both the Federal Priorities and RTP Investment Strategy show slight decline in hours of delay per traveler when compared with the 2035 No Build alternative. However, the overall hours of delay per traveler experience a significant increase from 2005 levels, demonstrating an overall lack of progress in meeting the target.

Freight Network Hours of Delay

This is a new performance target was recommended by MTAC to track truck hours of delay on the region's freight network, which they believe is a critical economic indicator. MPAC supported adding this new performance target. Using a 10 percent reduction in hours of delay from 2005, consistent with the target for vehicle hours of delay per person, the analysis showed that while both investment packages significantly reduced total hours of delay on the freight network (better than 22 percent) over the 2035 No Build, delay increases substantially from 2005. A next step will be to calculate hours of delay per truck on the freight network.

Climate change

The 2035 RTP calls for a 40 percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from 1990 levels by 2035, consistent with the state's target. Neither investment package moves the region closer to achieving the target. The transportation scenarios work completed in fall 2008 demonstrates the immense challenge to achieve the target through transportation investment alone. The RTP scenarios analyzed in 2008 demonstrated that even the most aggressive investments in transit still resulted in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions relative to 2005 levels.

MPAC discussed this target and recommended that "transportation-related" be added to the target to be clear this is focused on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.

Active transportation

The 2035 RTP sets a target to triple the number of walking, bicycling and transit trips over the plan horizon. The good news is trips via these travel modes experience a substantial increase from 2005, ranging from 74 percent for walking trips, 70 percent for bicycle trips and 107 percent for transit trips. While both investment packages included many projects that added to the region's pedestrian and bicycle network, the number of walking and bicycle trips declined relative to the 2035 No Build. The decrease is a function of how the model calculates walking and bicycle trips as a behavioral response to congestion. So in 2035, with no improvements addressing congestion, delay is so great that more people choose to walk and bike. Because both investment packages include projects that reduce delay relative to the No Build alternative, walk and bicycling trips fall slightly. In contrast, an expanded transit network is included in the model leading to increase ridership, as witnessed by the 13 percent increase in transit ridership in the RTP Investment Strategy over the No Build alternative. Some walk and bike trips are also assumed to have switched to transit trips in response to an expanded transit network.

MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff to consider whether the target should be to triple the share of trips made by each mode of travel instead of the number of trips made by each mode. MPAC also recommended that targets should be set for each mode rather than as an aggregate as proposed. Staff recommends the target be revised to call for tripling the share of trips made by walking, bicycling and transit.

Clean Air

The 2035 RTP calls for zero percent of the region's citizens to be exposed to at-risk levels of air pollution. The good news is that emissions of carbon monoxide, ozone, particulate matter, and others fall well below at-risk levels by 2035 for both investment packages.

Travel

The 2035 RTP sets a target for reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per person to 10 percent below 2005 levels. The good news is that both investment packages demonstrate a decline from 2005 levels, moving the region closer to the achieving the target. Both investment packages do come in with slightly higher levels of VMT per person when compared with No Build alternative. By 2035 under the No Build scenario congestion is so severe that the model forecasts more people switching to non-drive alone modes in the two-hour pm peak.

MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff to consider whether the target should be more aggressive given the connection of reducing VMT per person to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Federal legislation has called for a 16 percent reduction in VMT per person given forecasted growth in population and economic activity, which will result in continued growth in overall VMT in the region. Staff does not

recommend setting a more aggressive target at this time, but rather this should be considered as part of the climate change scenarios work that follows the RTP update.

Affordability

The 2035 RTP sets a target to reduce the average share of household income spent on housing and transportation costs combined by 25 percent below 2000 levels. This data was derived from Metro Scope as part of the RTP scenarios in 2008. A MetroScope analysis will be conducted as part of the final RTP system analysis in 2010. Based on the 2008 scenarios evaluation, all scenarios resulted in an increase in the average annual housing and transportation cost from 2000. This trend is expected to be the same for both RTP investment packages.

MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council discussed this target and have recommended the target be revised to call for a reduction in the percent of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income on housing and transportation combined.

Access to Daily Needs

The 2035 RTP sets a target to increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by bicycling and public transit for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations compared to 2005. A GIS analysis of this target has not been completed, but will be conducted as part of the final RTP system analysis in 2010.

MPAC discussed this target and recommended the target be revised to include "trails" and "sidewalks" and to report the information at a regional-level as well as for traditionally disadvantaged populations. MPAC recognized the importance of tracking progress toward improving access and the number of transportation options available to low-income and minority populations, but also felt it was important to improve access and options for everyone. An equity analysis will help ensure low-income and minority populations share in the benefits of transportation investments without bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. The analysis will also help the region meet federal Civil Rights and environmental justice policies through the long-range transportation planning process.

Additional analysis to be completed by the end of 2009

Additional analysis is underway that will include:

- Documentation of arterial and state-owned facilities that do not meet current RTP mobility standards.
- Documentation of the extent of congestion on state-owned facilities.
- Assessment of 2040 areas relative to the RTP modal targets, focusing on the central city and regional centers.
- Expanded analysis of sub-districts for key measures, including mode share and VMT (total and per person).
- Assessment of other system evaluation measures identified in Attachment 1.

The results of this analysis will be brought forward for consideration as it becomes available.

Additional analysis to be completed by early 2010

Other analysis will be conducted as part of the final system analysis in Dec. 2009-February 2010, including

- Assessment of projects that are located in environmentally sensitive areas.
- Air quality conformity of the Federal Priorities system.

The results of this analysis will be brought forward as part of the final RTP in Spring 2010.

Table 2.3

JPACT-Endorsed Draft Performance Targets *(transportation performance targets only)*

Track changes reflect recommendations from MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council as discussed the week of October 19.

Economy	Safety – By 2035, reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities by 50 percent compared to 2005.
	Congestion – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
	Freight reliability – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per truck by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Environment	Climate change – By 2035, reduce <u>transportation-related</u> carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.
	Active transportation – By 2035, triple <u>the share of</u> walking, biking and transit trips compared to 2005.
	Clean air – By 2035, ensure zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.
	Travel – By 2035, reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Equity	Affordability – By 2035, reduce <u>the share of average households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income combined cost of on housing and transportation by 25 percent combined</u> compared to 2000.
	Access to daily needs – By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations ¹ accessible within 30 minutes by <u>trails, bicycling and public transit or within 15 minutes by sidewalks</u> for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations compared to 2005.

¹ Consistent with the evaluation methodology used for the High Capacity Transit plan, essential destinations are defined as: hospitals and medical centers, major retail sites, major social service centers (with more than 200 monthly LIFT pick-up counts), colleges and universities, employers with greater than 1,500 employees, sports and attraction sites and major government sites.


Table 4.1 RTP System Evaluation Performance Indicators

Recommended System Evaluation Measures		RTP Goals									
		Foster Vibrant Communities and Compact Urban Form	Sustain Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity	Expand Transportation Choices	Effective and Efficient Management of Transportation System	Enhance Safety and Security	Promote Environmental Stewardship	Enhance Human Health	Ensure Equity	Ensure Fiscal Stewardship	Deliver Accountability
1.	Vehicle miles traveled (total and per capita)	●					●	●			
2.	Total delay and cost of delay on the regional freight network in mid-day and PM peak		●		●						
3.	Motor vehicle and transit travel time between key origin-destinations for mid-day and 2-HR PM peak	●	●	●	●						
4.	Congestion - Location of throughways, arterials, and regional freight network facilities that exceed RTP motor vehicle-based level of service thresholds in mid-day and 2-HR PM peak		●		●						
5.	Mode share and non-drive alone trips system-wide, by mobility corridor and for central city and individual regional centers (<i>Number of daily walking, bicycling, shared ride and transit trips and % by mode</i>)	●		●	●		●	●			
6.	Transit productivity (<i>transit boarding rides per revenue hour</i>) for High Capacity Transit (HCT) and bus	●		●					●		
7.	Number and percent of homes within ½-mile of regional trail system			●			●	●	●		
8.	Number and percent of homes and environmental justice communities (census data) within ½-mile of HCT or ¼-mile frequent bus service			●					●		
9.	Tons of transportation-related air pollutants (e.g. CO, ozone, and PM-10)			●			●	●			
10.	Tons of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. CO ₂)			●			●				
11.	Acres of regionally significant Goal 5 resources potentially affected by new transportation infrastructure	●					●				
Additional land use-related measures to be developed as part of the <i>Making the Greatest Place</i> .						<i>Unable to predict/forecast system safety. To be addressed in plan monitoring.</i>					<i>Unable to predict/forecast accountability. To be addressed in plan monitoring.</i>

Congestion

By 2035 reduce vehicle hours of delay per traveler by 10 percent compared to 2005.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Vehicle hours of delay per traveler	0.010	0.037	0.024	0.030	0.025	0.024	0.033	0.029	0.031	0.030	(0.009)
Vehicle hours of delay	7,865	46,644	29,217	37,616	31,335	30,260	41,390	35,890	38,823	37,599	




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model.

Climate change

By 2035, reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent compared to 1990 levels.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Carbon dioxide emissions (tons)	16,696	23,423	25,268	23,504	26,856	26,748	24,645	24,345	24,829	24,908	(10,018)




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model and does not account for changes to land use, vehicle fuel efficiencies and technology or pricing strategies. Target is estimated 40 percent reduction from 2005 levels, pending development of a 1990 greenhouse gas emissions estimate.

Active transportation

By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit trips compared to 2005.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Walking trips	394,105	702,168	677,752	687,951	665,136	665,282	701,595	704,035	684,112	680,283	1,182,314
Biking trips	64,428	113,243	108,722	110,873	106,861	106,851	117,257	117,509	110,148	109,842	193,285
Transit trips	243,216	483,913	520,996	631,332	519,594	521,445	560,812	564,295	506,399	546,514	729,647
											2,105,246




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model.

Travel

By 2035 reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Vehicle miles traveled per person	14.23	13.17	13.71	13.12	14.31	14.39	13.34	13.32	13.41	13.450	(12.811)




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model.

Clean Air

By 2035 ensure zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy
ozone emissions (pounds)	127,947	31,564	31,864	29,719	34,055	33,881	31,246	30,887	31,417	31,507




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model. In February 2007, the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission adopted an updated Portland Ozone Maintenance Plan and the US EPA approved it. Air quality conformity determinations are no longer required for ozone. However, Metro and DEQ have agreed that ozone levels will continue to be projected to assess future trends, although no motor vehicle emission budgets, or maximum levels of ozone precursors from on-road transportation sources are available for comparison.

Clean Air

By 2035 ensure zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.

	2005	2007	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Maximum daily allowance
Carbon monoxide emissions (pounds)	1,105,718	935,394	778,775	845,535	790,048	912,402	907,557	830,544	819,510	835,017	836,527	1,181,341




Data is derived from the regional travel demand model. 2035 maximum daily allowance is from the State Implementation Plan (SIP) approved by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2006.

Affordability

By 2035, reduce the average household combined cost of housing and transportation by 25 percent compared to 2000.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Annual cost of housing and transportation \$	24,900	<i>data not available</i>	\$ 27,400	\$ 27,400	\$ 27,500	<i>data not available</i>	\$ 27,400	\$ 27,400	<i>data not available</i>	<i>data not available</i>	\$ (18,675)




Data is derived from MetroScope. Costs shown in 2005 dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.

Freight delay

By 2035 reduce hours of delay on the freight network by 10 percent compared to 2005.

	2005	2035 No Build	2035 Connectivity Scenario	2035 Transit Scenario	2035 Highway Scenario (no HOT lanes)	2035 Highway Scenario (with HOT lanes)	2035 Management Scenario (no tolls)	2035 Management Scenario (with tolls)	2035 Federal Priorities	2035 RTP Investment Strategy	2035 Target
Hours of delay in 1 hour mid-day travel period	434	3,559	2,617	3,201	1,608	1,569	3,211	2,281	2,769	2,665	

Hours of delay on regional freight network



Data is for mid-day 1-hour travel period inside the urban growth boundary

HR 2724 IH

111th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 2724

To amend title 49, United States Code, to establish national transportation objectives and performance targets for the purpose of assessing progress toward meeting national transportation objectives.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 4, 2009

Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. CARNAHAN) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

A BILL

To amend title 49, United States Code, to establish national transportation objectives and performance targets for the purpose of assessing progress toward meeting national transportation objectives.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the `National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009'.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE TARGETS.

(a) In General- Chapter 3 of title 49, United States Code, in amended:

- (1) by redesignating sections 304 through 309 as sections 307 through 312;
- (2) by redesignating sections 303 and 303a as sections 305 and 306, respectively; and
- (3) by inserting after section 302, the following:

`Sec. 303. National transportation objectives and performance targets

`(a) Statement of Purpose- The purpose of this section is to establish national transportation objectives to provide a 21st century vision for the national surface transportation system and national transportation performance targets to ensure that transportation investments result in a national surface transportation system that meets the needs of the 21st century.

`(b) National Transportation Objectives- The national transportation objectives are established and prioritized, as follows:

- `(1) Promote energy efficiency and achieve energy security.
- `(2) Ensure environmental protection, restore climate stability, and resolve persistent environmental justice issues.
- `(3) Improve economic competitiveness, system efficiency, and workplace development opportunities.
- `(4) Ensure safety for all transportation users and improved public health outcomes.
- `(5) Improve transportation system conditions and connectivity.
- `(6) Provide equal and equitable access to transportation options in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

`(c) National Transportation Performance Targets- The national transportation performance targets are established for the purpose of assessing progress in the 20-year period beginning the day after the date of enactment of the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009 toward meeting the national transportation objectives, as follows:

- `(1) Reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled by 16 percent.
- `(2) Triple walking, biking, and public transportation usage.
- `(3) Reduce transportation-generated carbon dioxide level by 40 percent.
- `(4) Reduce delay per capita by 10 percent.
- `(5) Increase proportion of freight transportation provided by railroad and intermodal services by 20 percent.
- `(6) Achieve 0 percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.

FEEDBACK

- ` (7) Improve public safety and lower congestion costs by reducing traffic crashes by 50 percent.
- ` (8) Increase share of major highways, regional transit fleets and facilities, and bicycling/pedestrian infrastructure in good state of repair condition by 20 percent.
- ` (9) Reduce average household combined housing plus transportation costs by 25 percent, using 2000 as a base year.
- ` (10) Increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations (work and non-work) accessible within 30 minutes by public transportation or 15 minutes by walking, for low-income, senior, and disabled populations.
- ` (d) Development of Baseline Levels- Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009, the Secretary of Transportation shall develop baseline levels for the national transportation performance targets established by this section and determine appropriate methods of data collection to assess success in meeting such performance targets.
- ` (e) Requirements- The Secretary, consistent with the plan developed under section 304 and notwithstanding any other provision of law in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009, shall--
 - ` (1) develop appropriate data collections systems for each Federal surface transportation program in order to evaluate:
 - ` (A) whether such programs are consistent with the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section; and
 - ` (B) how effective such programs are in contributing to the achievement of the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section;
 - ` (2) using the criteria developed under paragraph (1), annually evaluate each such program and provide the results to the public;
 - ` (3) based on the evaluation performed under paragraph (2), make any necessary changes or improvements to such programs to ensure such consistency and effectiveness;
 - ` (4) align the availability and award of Federal surface transportation funding to meet the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section, consistent with the evaluation performed under paragraph (2);
 - ` (5) carry out this section in a manner that is consistent with sections 302, 5503, 10101, and 13101 of this title and section 101 of title 23 to the extent that such sections do not conflict with the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section;
 - ` (6) review, update, and reissue all relevant surface transportation planning requirements to ensure that such requirements require that regional, State, and local surface transportation planning efforts funded with Federal funds are consistent with the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section; and
 - ` (7) require recipients of Federal surface transportation funds to annually report on the use of such funds, including a description of--
 - ` (A) which projects and priorities were funded with such funds;
 - ` (B) the rationale and method employed for apportioning such funds to the projects and priorities; and
 - ` (C) how the obligation of such funds is consistent with or advances the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section.
- ` (f) Authority-
 - ` (1) IN GENERAL- Notwithstanding any other provision of law in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009, the Secretary may, through a process of public notice and comment and with reasonable prior notice to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure preceding any significant change, consistent with the public interest, amend the performance targets under subsection (c) or develop additional performance targets to effectively meet the policy and objectives set forth in this section.
 - ` (2) RECOMMENDATIONS- The Secretary may also make recommendations to those Committees for reorganizing the Department of Transportation, as necessary and consistent with the requirements of section 304(b)(6), in order to achieve the policy, objectives, and performance targets established by this section.

` Sec. 304. National surface transportation performance plan

- ` (a) Development- Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the National Transportation Objectives Act of 2009, the Secretary of Transportation shall develop and implement a National Surface Transportation Performance Plan to achieve the policy, objectives, and performance targets set forth in section 303.
- ` (b) Contents- The plan shall include--

`(1) an assessment of the current performance of the national surface transportation system and an analysis of the system's ability to achieve the policy, objectives, and performance targets set forth in section 303;

`(2) an analysis of emerging and long-term projected trends that will impact the performance, needs, and uses of the national surface transportation system;

`(3) a description of the major impediments to effectively meeting the policy, objectives, and performance targets set forth in section 303 and recommended actions to address such impediments;

`(4) a comprehensive strategy and investment plan to meet the policy, objectives, and performance targets set forth in section 303;

`(5) initiatives to improve transportation modeling, research, data collection, and analysis; and

`(6) a plan for any reorganization of the Department of Transportation or its agencies necessary to meet the policy, objectives, and performance targets set forth in section 303.

`(c) Consultation- In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall--

`(1) consult with local, State, and tribal governments, public and private transportation providers and carriers, non-profit organizations representing transportation employees, appropriate foreign governments, and other interested parties; and

`(2) provide public notice and hearings and solicit public comments on the plan.

`(d) Submittal- The Secretary shall submit the completed plan to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

`(e) Progress Reports- The Secretary shall submit biennial progress reports on the implementation of the plan beginning 2 years after the date of submittal of the plan under subsection (d) to the Committees. The progress report shall--

`(1) describe progress made toward fully implementing the plan and achieving the policies, objectives, and performance targets established under section 303;

`(2) describe challenges and obstacles to full implementation;

`(3) describe updates to the plan necessary to reflect changed circumstances or new developments; and

`(4) make policy and legislative recommendations the Secretary believes are necessary and appropriate to fully implement the plan.

`(f) Data- The Secretary shall have the authority to conduct studies, gather information, and require the production of data necessary to develop or update this plan, consistent with Federal privacy standards.

`(g) Funding- The Secretary may use such sums as may be necessary from any funds provided to the Department of Transportation for surface transportation programs for the purpose of completing and updating the plan and developing and issuing the progress reports pursuant to this section.'.

(b) Conforming Amendments-

(1) Section 302(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking `10101 and 13101' and inserting `303, 10101, and 13101'.

(2) Section 308, as redesignated, of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking `sections 301-09304' and inserting `sections 301 through 307'.

(3) The table of contents for chapter 3 of title 49, United States Code, is amended--

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 303 through 309 as relating to sections 305 through 312; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 302 the following:

`303. National surface transportation policy.

`304. National surface transportation performance plan.'.

END

 Metro | Memo

Date: October 28, 2009
To: TPAC and interested parties
From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Discussion items (Exhibit F) and Consent Items (Exhibit G)

The 30-day public comment period ended on October 15, 2009. Proposed amendments to the draft RTP have been separated into two exhibits to the resolution:

- **Exhibit F (Discussion Items for Consideration)** – This exhibit includes comments and policy issues recommended for further discussion and approval individually. **This exhibit will be the focus of the October 30 TPAC meeting. The full package of discussion items will be brought to TPAC for a recommendation to JPACT on November 20, and then back to JPACT for action on December 10.**
- **Exhibit G (Consent Items for Consideration)** - The attached comment log identifies proposed amendments to respond to public comments received between September 15 and October 15, 2009. **This exhibit is proposed for approval on a “consent” basis without further discussion. Committee members can request discussion of any of these consent items at the October 30 meeting.** TPAC is requested to make a recommendation to JPACT on the consent items at the October 30 meeting.

A summary of upcoming discussions and actions is provided for reference.

October 28	Deadline for MPAC member amendments to RTP
October 30	TPAC discussion of RTP discussion items; recommendation on consent items
November 2	Deadline for JPACT member amendments to RTP
November 4	MTAC recommendation to MPAC
November 12	JPACT discussion on RTP discussion items
November 18	MPAC recommendation to the Metro Council
November 20	TPAC recommendation to JPACT
December 10	JPACT recommendation to the Metro Council
December 17	Metro Council action on RTP by Resolution

Following “acceptance” by the Metro Council, staff would then complete a final analysis of the plan’s projects and prepare findings, a final draft document, alternative mobility standards and regional transportation functional plan amendments for public review and hearings in Spring 2010. MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council will consider final adoption of the RTP by ordinance in June 2010.



Date: October 28, 2009
To: TPAC and interested parties
From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments - Discussion Issues (Exhibit F)

Attached to this memo is a summary of five discussion issues and recommendations for your consideration as Exhibit F:

- **RTP Discussion Item #1**
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND HB 2001 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS
How should the region move forward to proactively meet state and regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets?
- **RTP Discussion Item #2**
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PERFORMANCE TARGETS
JPACT endorsed the performance targets in the draft RTP. Should performance targets be retained in the final Regional Transportation Plan?
- **RTP Discussion Item #3**
ALTERNATIVE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR STATE FACILITIES IN THE METRO REGION
How can the region work together with the Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon Transportation Commission to develop alternative mobility standards for state facilities in the Metro region that support the region's desired outcomes?
- **RTP Discussion Item #4**
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION PROCESS
JPACT endorsed the factors presented in this item. What additional input would you like to provide on prioritizing completion of the five proposed corridor refinement plans?
- **RTP Discussion Item #5**
I-5/99W CONNECTOR STUDY AREA – ISSUES, OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?

In addition, a log of comments received on these issues is also attached for reference. Individual recommendations are included within the discussion item.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND HB 2001 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS

How should the region move forward to proactively meet state and regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets?


Background:

- The 2007 Legislature established statewide targets for greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) – calling for stopping increases in GHG emissions by 2010; 10 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2020 and a 75 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050.
- In December 2008, 65 percent of the participants at the joint MPAC and JPACT meeting voted the region should be very proactive in developing land use and transportation strategies that reduce vehicle miles traveled to meet the state targets. Furthermore, participants called for emphasizing transit, land use, congestion pricing, bike/pedestrian and intelligent transportation system (ITS) strategies to reach State GHG reduction targets.
- The 2009 Legislature required Metro to “develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios” designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles by January 2012 through HB 2001 (Sections 37 and 38). It also requires Metro to adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment. Finally, local governments are required to adopt comprehensive plan and land use regulations consistent with the adopted scenario.
- This component of HB 2001 is intended to ensure statewide targets for GHG emissions are being addressed in metropolitan transportation plans and regional and local land use plans. Metro is the first metropolitan planning organization to do such planning.
- The draft RTP plan sets a new policy direction for meeting the statewide targets and implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. Central to the draft RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region’s desired outcomes and state goals for reductions in vehicle miles traveled and corresponding GHG emissions. Preliminary results from the transportation model analysis show the draft RTP does not meet the state targets for GHG emissions – and in fact show increases from today.
- National studies have suggested that transportation investments alone will not achieve required reductions in transportation-related GHG emissions. The *Making the Greatest Place* effort highlights the need to invest more aggressively in our downtowns, main streets and employment areas consistent with the Region 2040 Growth Concept.
- National studies also suggest that pricing techniques are a critical component of any comprehensive strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. JPACT did not endorse an application of that approach in the 2035 RTP update.
- Transportation infrastructure, transportation pricing, technology and land use are part of the solutions recommended by the draft RTP. The effect of more aggressive application of each these strategies will be tested as part of the HB 2001 land use and transportation scenarios in 2010.
- The required scenario planning includes further development of tools and policies in Oregon than were anticipated in the draft RTP. Significant work program and scoping activities are continuing to be developed to respond to HB 2001 requirements.

- A draft work program is shown in Attachment 1:
 - A GHG inventory will be prepared to provide a baseline of emissions from which further forecasting and modeling will be conducted to address the HB 2001 requirements.
 - Develop modeling procedures to ensure consistent, best practices around GHG estimation and analysis for transportation and land use studies in the Metro area. The basics of those requirements will be transferable to the HB 2001 requirements.
 - Enhance the regional travel demand model to develop a base condition that better accounts for GHG emissions reductions from vehicle technology and fuels already underway; test additional options for further improvement.
 - Current regional transportation models will be further enhanced to more rigorously quantify the travel by individuals, considering walking, biking and transit travel preferences and the effect of congestion on travel decisions by analyzing vehicular flow in a more dynamic time continuum.
 - The region will continue its transition to EPA's MOVES model for analyzing transportation-related GHG emissions.
 - The estimation of GHG derived from the built environment will also be improved. Metro will investigate using MetroScope, Metro's integrated land use-transportation forecasting model, to forecast residential GHG emissions. Additional efforts to validate energy consumption coefficients and GHG emissions variables in MetroScope will have to be completed and properly vetted through an expert technical review panel. Additional consultant resources may be needed to assist staff in developing GHG emissions from non-residential sources.
 - Modeling refinements have been identified related to MetroScope's calculation of potential redevelopment and infill. The likelihood of future individuals and businesses to locate in brownfields or redevelopment/infill opportunities in the context of developing smart growth options and its impact on GHG emissions will be analyzed. The equations for estimating redevelopment and infill opportunities will enhance the forecasting acuity for both residential and non-residential real estate projections.
 - Incorporate land use decisions made in 2010 and 2011 prior to adoption of the recommended scenario.
 - Other policy development and public involvement activities.

Recommendation:

- Metro will lead this effort in coordination with local, regional and state partners.
- MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council approval of the RTP targets and land use targets to be developed by early 2010 to be used to guide development and evaluation of the performance of HB 2001 land use and transportation scenarios in ~~2010~~2011.
- MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council commitment to policy discussions on the application of pricing strategies in the Metro region in 2010.
- Metro will incorporate recommendations from this effort in the next RTP update in 2014.



Key

- Document/Deliverable
- Decision Point
- Event
- Process

Project Sponsor: Mike Hoglund
 Project Lead: Tom Kloster

Planning & Development:
 Kim Ellis
 Tony Mendoza
 Ray Valone

Research Center:
 Cindy Pederson
 Dennis Yee
 Dick Walker

Sustainability Center:
 Heidi Rahn

Project Objective: HB 2001 Sec. 37 requires metropolitan service districts to develop land use and transportation scenarios designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from certain vehicles.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PERFORMANCE TARGETS

JPACT endorsed the performance targets shown in Attachment 1. Should performance targets be retained in the final Regional Transportation Plan?

Background:

- Over the past three years, Metro worked with state and local government partners as well as residents, community groups, and businesses to develop the draft RTP. The result of that work is a plan that responds to transportation needs and demands based on shared community values and the outcomes we are trying to achieve as a region.
- Central to the draft RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region's desired outcomes.
- The draft plan sets a new course for future transportation decisions and implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. The draft RTP continues to move away from a single measure of success and has adopted an outcomes-based framework that emphasizes desired outcomes and measurable performance. Policies have shifted from primarily using roadway level-of-service to a broader system completion policy to define system needs.
- Raising the bar from past RTPs, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation endorsed a set of transportation performance targets that support the region's desired outcomes and the plan's goals and objectives. Per JPACT direction, the targets provided policy direction for developing the investment strategy proposed in the draft RTP.
- Attachment 1 lists the RTP targets, which are drawn from federal and state legislation and subsequent JPACT discussions on what measures are most important to consider in the context of the RTP. The RTP targets are a subset of a broader set of targets recommended to be further developed in 2010. Attachment includes proposed changes recommended by MTAC on October 21 and MPAC at their October 23 retreat.
- One aim of the draft RTP is to maintain highway performance as much as feasible while supporting the desired outcomes that are the core of the 2040 Growth Concept and the region's land use and transportation strategy. Delays caused by freeway congestion pose significant economic challenges for freight transportation and commuters, affecting our region's economic competitiveness, environment and quality of life.
- The draft RTP also aims to attract jobs and housing in downtowns, main streets and employment areas; increase walking, biking and the use of public transit; and reduce travel distances and the need to travel by car to help reduce air pollution and the region's carbon footprint.
- Since the 1990's, the region has successfully implemented policies to expand transportation choices, reduce dependence on the automobile and fight long commutes and traffic congestion more successfully than comparable urban areas. While congestion has increased, travel times have decreased according to recently-released Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) analysis. Vehicle miles traveled per person continues its steady decline. Walking, biking and regional transit ridership continues to grow. In the 1960s, the region averaged 180 days of air quality violations every year for ozone and carbon monoxide, but today we average zero.

- The targets were intended to be aspirational – recognizing the region has more work ahead in the research, model development and policy development realms as part of the state-required HB 2001 climate change scenarios work and future RTP updates.
- Preliminary results from the transportation model analysis indicate that the proposed investment strategy does not get the region to where we want to be. The draft RTP moves us closer toward the targets in some areas, but falls short of meeting all of them, particularly reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
- Investments that work together toward achieving a broad set of performance targets is critical for the region to be successful in realizing a truly integrated, multi-modal transportation system that helps achieve the region’s desired outcomes. Transportation infrastructure, transportation pricing, technology, and alternative land use strategies are part of the solutions recommended by the draft RTP. The effect of more aggressive application of each these strategies will be tested as part of the HB 2001 land use and transportation scenarios in 2010.

Recommendation:

- MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council adoption of the RTP performance targets as proposed in Attachment 1 in the draft RTP. The targets can be revised over time based on additional information on performance or effectiveness. Adopting the targets now allows the process to begin; and allows the targets to guide the development and evaluation of land use and transportation scenarios in 2010.
- MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council adoption of a broader set of measures and targets for the *Making the Greatest Place* effort by early 2010 that include land use as well as equity, economic and environmental measures that align with the region’s desired outcomes and policy objectives.
- Metro will use the RTP targets and yet to be developed land use targets to evaluate the performance of HB 2001 land use and transportation scenarios in 2010. The collective set of targets will elevate the dialogue about land use and transportation policies and their respective roles in meeting regional and state objectives, including climate change goals.
- Metro will expand current regional data collection efforts to monitor these and other indicators that cannot be forecasted through the regional land use or transportation models to provide accountability for achieving the region’s desired outcomes. Decision-makers can use this information to adapt local and regional policies and investment strategies based on what is learned.
- As the region increasingly shares similar desired outcomes, the need to use similar performance measures increases. To take advantage of this, Metro is embarking on an effort with PSU’s Institute of Metropolitan Studies to develop a coordinated regional approach to develop and utilize performance measures. As this new regional approach is developed, the performance targets and indicators identified in the draft RTP can be included into a broader, even more holistic performance measure system for the region.

Discussion Item #2 - Attachment 1

Table 2.3

JPACT-Endorsed Draft Performance Targets *(transportation performance targets only)*

Track changes reflect recommendations from MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council as discussed the week of October 19.

Economy	Safety – By 2035, reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities by 50 percent compared to 2005.
	Congestion – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
	Freight reliability – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per truck by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Environment	Climate change – By 2035, reduce <u>transportation-related</u> carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.
	Active transportation – By 2035, triple <u>the share of</u> walking, biking and transit trips compared to 2005.
	Clean air – By 2035, ensure zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.
	Travel – By 2035, reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Equity	Affordability – By 2035, reduce <u>the share of average households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income combined cost of on housing and transportation by 25 percent combined</u> compared to 2000.
	Access to daily needs – By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations ¹ accessible within 30 minutes by <u>trails, bicycling and public transit or within 15 minutes by sidewalks</u> for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations compared to 2005.

¹ Consistent with the evaluation methodology used for the High Capacity Transit plan, essential destinations are defined as: hospitals and medical centers, major retail sites, major social service centers (with more than 200 monthly LIFT pick-up counts), colleges and universities, employers with greater than 1,500 employees, sports and attraction sites and major government sites.

ALTERNATIVE MOBILITY STANDARDS FOR STATE FACILITIES IN THE METRO REGION

How can the region work together with the Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon Transportation Commission to develop alternative mobility standards for state facilities in the Metro region that support the region's desired outcomes?

Background:

- With adoption of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, and subsequent Oregon Transportation Commission approval of alternative mobility standards for the region in 2001, the RTP began to move away from level of service as the primary measure for determining success of the plan.
- The alternative mobility standard approved by the OTC in 2001 is included in the draft 2035 RTP, and reflects a tiered approach to managing congestion, and the dual philosophy of promoting multimodal solutions in centers and corridors and preserving freight mobility in industrial areas and on routes that provide access to freight terminals and intermodal facilities.
- One aim of the draft RTP is to maintain highway performance as much as feasible while supporting the desired outcomes that are the core of the 2040 Growth Concept and the region's land use and transportation strategy. Delays caused by freeway congestion pose significant economic challenges for freight transportation and commuters, affecting our region's economic competitiveness, environment and quality of life.
- The draft RTP also aims to attract jobs and housing in downtowns, main streets and employment areas; increase walking, biking and the use of public transit; and reduce travel distances and the need to travel by car to help reduce air pollution and the region's carbon footprint.
- Central to the draft RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region's desired outcomes. The RTP includes specific performance targets and indicators that we will monitor over time to determine how well the region is doing and whether adjustments to policies and strategies are needed.
- Since the 1990's, the region has successfully implemented policies to expand transportation choices, reduce dependence on the automobile and fight long commutes and traffic congestion more successfully than comparable urban areas. While congestion has increased, travel times have decreased according to recently-released Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) analysis. Vehicle miles traveled per person continues its steady decline. Walking, biking and regional transit ridership continues to grow. In the 1960s, the region averaged 180 days of air quality violations every year for ozone and carbon monoxide, but today we average zero. These are successes that are not recognized by the current mobility standards, but that will help achieve the region's desired outcomes.
- The OTC is the approval body for any amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan. ODOT and Metro have requested OTC agreement to move forward to develop alternative mobility standards for the Metro region. This request is based on the expectation that we will no longer meet the current alternative standard.
- See Attachment 1 for reference.

- The OTC is the approval body for amendments to the alternative mobility standards in the Oregon Highway Plan. The Land Conservation and Development Commission will be the approval body for the RTP, itself.
- A goal of this effort is to demonstrate consistency with the Oregon Highway Plan in preparation for the LCDC action in Fall 2010, including any amendments to the OHP that the OTC may agree to make.
- LCDC will make a judgment on whether the RTP has done due diligence to be consistent with Statewide planning goals, the Transportation Planning Rule, the Oregon Transportation Plan, and by extension the Oregon Highway Plan and other state modal plans.

Recommendation:

- ODOT and Metro staff lead the effort to define alternative mobility standards in coordination with local and regional partners.
- **November - December 2009** - MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council consider acceptance of the draft RTP (by Resolution).
- **December 2009 – January 2010** – Technical evaluation and documentation of the extent of congestion in the region. This work will involve documenting the inability to meet the current mobility standards and the range of measures and strategies to be considered when developing the proposal.
- **February 2010** – MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council policy discussions on the extent of the congestion problem and the range of measures and strategies proposed.
- **March 2010** – Metro region request forwarded to the OTC for consideration and approval.
- **April – May 2010** – Final public comment period and hearings on RTP.
- **June 2010** – MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council consider final approval of RTP (by Ordinance).
- **Fall 2010** – Final RTP decision forwarded to the Land Conservation and Development Commission for consideration and approval.



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Discussion Item #3 Attachment 1

Department of Transportation

Region 1

123 NW Flanders

Portland, OR 97209-4019

(503) 731-8200

FAX: (503) 731-8259

DATE: September 29, 2009

TO: Oregon Transportation Commission

FROM: Jason Tell, Manager, ODOT Region 1
Robin McArthur, AICP, Planning and Development Director, Metro

SUBJECT: Metro Request for alternative mobility standards

File Code:

The Portland region is nearly finished with a major update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The updated RTP includes significant new policy and fiscal initiatives that will help the Portland region cope with rapid growth in the face of limited transportation funding. The plan sets forth a new, corridor-based strategy for protecting mobility on ODOT facilities that continues to support the Oregon Transportation Plan and Oregon Highway Plan, while also meeting regional objectives for managing growth and maintaining livability.

This new multimodal and multi-facility mobility corridor approach calls for tailored mobility standards that help achieve corridor-specific outcomes for economic development and community health, while protecting through-movements of statewide and interstate travel. The purpose of this memo is to inform the Commission of the collaborative work Metro and ODOT staff will undertake to develop a more comprehensive and tailored set of mobility standards in the Portland metropolitan area. This work will involve drafting alternative Oregon Highway Plan standards for OTC consideration in early 2010, leading to final adoption of the RTP in late spring. Metro and ODOT anticipate coming to the Commission in Winter 2010 with a presentation on the extent of the congestion problem and the proposed approach to resolving it, and again in the Spring of 2010 with proposed alternative mobility standards and a broad range of actions to maintain highway performance as much as feasible and avoid further degradation.

ODOT and Metro staff have outlined the following principles for drafting alternative mobility standards:

1. The RTP Mobility Corridors will serve as the alternative mobility policy framework.
2. Volume to capacity (V/C) will continue to be the primary measure of mobility for interstate highways and OHP freight routes.
3. Interim V/C standards may be developed for RTP "refinement plan corridors", where more analysis is needed to determine the modes, functions, mobility standards and other performance standards, and general locations of improvements. These are corridors where more planning is required to identify feasible transportation solutions -- five refinement plans are proposed in the draft RTP.
4. Mobility standards will be tailored for each mobility corridor.

OHP_Amendment_Memo.doc
9/29/2009



5. The V/C standards may be organized by peak hours and/or days, or by the duration of congestion within a given period.
6. Policy about the function of individual interchanges within the Metro region could be established.
7. The ability of ODOT to require traffic and safety mitigation through the development review and plan amendment process will be retained.
8. District and Regional Highways could be managed using multiple or graduated standards that help the region meet desired growth management goals along these routes.

As part of the remaining steps in completing the RTP update, the region will document the inability to meet the current mobility standards due to severe financial, environmental and land use constraints, together with the need to accommodate additional growth, leading to the need for alternative OHP mobility standards,. Metro and ODOT are working in coordination with local partners on all aspects of the new plan, including the development of mobility corridor strategies and alternative mobility standards.

As part of the findings of consistency with Actions 1F.3 and 1F.5 of the OHP, Metro and ODOT will develop a table of responses that includes a description of the region's and local jurisdictions' proposed actions to maintain performance of state highways as much as feasible, in the RTP as well as local TSPs, land use plans, and development approvals, with identification of responsibilities and a timeline for completion of this work.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

JPACT and MPAC endorsed the factors presented in Attachment 1. Attachment 2 presents the draft ratings based on the technical factors. What recommendation would you like to provide on prioritizing completion of the five proposed corridor refinement plans?

Background:

- The public review draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies five mobility corridors where more analysis is needed through a future corridor refinement plan. Refinement plans generally involve a combination of transportation and land use analysis, multiple local jurisdictions and facilities operated by multiple transportation providers.

Mobility Corridors Recommended for Future Corridor Refinement Plans

- Mobility Corridors #2, #3 and #20 - Portland Central City to Wilsonville, which includes I-5 South
- Mobility Corridor #4 - Portland Central City Loop, which includes I-5/I-405 Loop
- Mobility Corridors #7, #8 & #9 - Clark County to I-5 via Gateway, Oregon City and Tualatin, which includes I-205
- Mobility Corridor #15 - Gresham/Fairview/Wood Village/Troutdale to Damascus
- Mobility Corridor #24 - Beaverton to Forest Grove, which includes Tualatin Valley Highway
- In order to move forward, agreement is needed on prioritization factors that can be used to compare and prioritize the relative urgency of planning for future transportation solutions across the region's mobility corridors. The purpose of this discussion is to obtain input on the prioritization factors that will be used to prioritize the proposed corridor refinement plans by the end of 2009 as part of the RTP update.
- It is important to distinguish between these prioritization factors and the more specific performance indicators that will be used during an actual corridor refinement plan. The holistic (multimodal and land use) planning evaluation that will be accomplished through refinement plans that are ultimately conducted will examine performance, costs (impacts) and benefits of identified land use and transportation solutions that will in turn help refine, package and prioritize locally supported projects and other strategies to address corridor issues.
- The first five factors identified below (A-D) include measures that relate to technical considerations, while the local commitment measures (E) address issues of readiness and urgency for corridor planning. The factors presented below were first reviewed by the Regional Transportation Plan Work Group (September 21) and were then brought before TPAC (September 25). TPAC's revisions were incorporated, and the factors were reviewed and endorsed by JPACT (October 8). The factors were presented, discussed and approved at MTAC (October 21) and at the MPAC retreat (October 23) as well.

Recommendation:

- Apply the factors to the five corridors as presented in Attachment 1. The factors identified above provide sufficient coverage of the six desired regional outcomes to serve as a basis to prioritize the five proposed corridor refinement plans.
- The results of this work are summarized in Attachment 2 will be brought forward for MTAC consideration on November 4 and MPAC consideration on November 18 as part of their action on the RTP. Staff will carry its recommendations based on the technical prioritization factors to TPAC on October 30. TPAC's recommendation will be brought to JPACT for discussion in November and action in December.

RTP Discussion Item 4 Attachment 1

Prioritization Factors:

It is important that prioritization of refinement plans align with the six regional desired outcomes that were adopted by MPAC and the Metro Council as part of the “Making the Greatest Place” effort. The bullets listed below show the key supporting indicators within the five factor categories relate to desired outcomes. Note that several factors support more than one outcome, or loosely relate to all of them.

- Vibrant Communities (A4, B1, B2, B4)
- Economic Prosperity (A5, B3, D1, D5, D6, E1, E3)
- Safe and Reliable Transportation (B1, B2, B3, B4, D1, D2)
- Leadership on Climate Change (A3, A4, C1, E1)
- Clean Air and Water (A3, A4, B1, B2, B4)
- Equity (A4, B1, B2, C1, D3, D4, D5, D6, E1, E2, E3)

A: Consistency with State and Regional Plans and Policies

- A1: 2001 corridor refinement plan ratings/rankings (*for information only—not included in ranking*)
A2: 2005 corridor refinement plan ratings/rankings (this more recent set of rankings will be included in the quantified technical assessment and forthcoming staff recommendation)
A3: Support for the Region 2040 plan (number of primary land uses in the corridor)
A4: High Capacity Transit System Plan ranking
A5: Regional Freight Plan consistency (freight routes, facilities, volumes and freight-related corridor needs identified)

B: Environment

- B1: Pedestrian network gap (percent of sidewalks complete in pedestrian districts or transit/mixed-use corridors)
B2: Transit coverage (percent of households and jobs covered by 15 minute transit service)
B3: Street connectivity (number of intersections per square mile)
B4: Bicycle network gap (length of gap) per household
B5: Traffic volumes on corridor roadways

C: Equity

- C1: Number of low-income, senior, disabled and minority and/or Hispanic population in the corridor.

D: Economy (includes system performance as well as economic indicators)

- D1: Congestion in the corridor (volume to capacity ratios for regional throughways and arterial streets)
D2: Safety (number of top spots for number and severity of accidents from ODOT data)
D3: Total households in corridor (2005)
D4: Total households in corridor (2035)
D5: Total jobs in corridor (2005)
D6: Total jobs in corridor (2035)
D7: Freight volume as percentage of total volume (trucks)

E: Local Commitment and Support (local jurisdictions will submit support)

- E1: Local support—letter indicating agreement to go forward, description of corridor issues and potential solutions
E2: Community interest—levels and sources of community support and/or opposition either to the plan or to solutions being discussed
E3: Need and readiness for a refinement plan—issues requiring land use or investment certainty need for transportation solutions to implement land use plans or local aspirations within the urban growth boundary
E4: Local resource commitment—in-kind or monetary resources that local jurisdictions can commit to in order to leverage regional commitment

Discussion Item #4 Attachment 2

RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN *DRAFT* PRIORITIZATION MATRIX: **RAW DATA + SOURCES** FOR REFERENCE (October 26, 2009)

	Description	Mobility Corridors Involved	Data Sources	2, 3 and 20			4	7, 8 and 9			15	24
				Portland Central City to Wilsonville, Including Tigard-Sherwood/Newberg/Tualatin, including I-5 South	Portland Central City Loop, Including I-5/I-405 Downtown Loop	Clark County to I-5 via Gateway, Oregon City and Tualatin, including I-205	Cities of East Multnomah County to Damascus (I-84/I-576 Connector)		Beaverton to Forest Grove (Tualatin Valley Hwy)			
				Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 20	Corridor 4	Corridor 7	Corridor 8	Corridor 9	Corridor 15	Data from Corridors 22/23
A: Consistency with State and Regional Plans/Policies												
A1: Previous refinement plan ratings/ranking (2001) INFORMATION ONLY-not included in scores	Metro Memo (2001)			3	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	2
A2: Previous refinement plan prioritization ratings/ranking (2005)	Metro Memo (2005 ranking)			2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	1
A3: Support Region 2040 (# of primary land uses in corridor - PDX CBD, Regional Centers, Industrial Centers, Freight/Passenger intermodal)	Mobility Atlas			2	1	1	4	2	4	2	4	3
A4: High Capacity Transit Plan (ranking)	HCT Priority Tiers				3		0	2			1	2
A5: Regional Freight Plan consistency	Plan Narrative (Ranking)				3		3	2			3	1
B: Environment												
B1: Pedestrian network gap (% of sidewalks in pedestrian districts/corridors, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	Mobility Atlas			40%/46%	75%/67%	61%/59% (56.5% Corridor Average)	83.9%/81%	37.2%	57.7%	61.6% (52.3% Corridor Average)	50.1%/74.3 (62.2% Average)	63.5/19.2%; (41.4% Average)
B2: Transit coverage (% of households/% of jobs covered by 15 min transit service, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	Mobility Atlas			HH: 27.9%; Jobs: 50.3%	HH: 3.6%; Jobs: 4.6%	HH: 13.3%; Jobs: 8.1%	HH: 92%; Jobs: 97.8%	HH: 17.7%; Jobs: 38.1%	HH: 52.8%; Jobs: 49.5%	HH: 71.9%; Jobs: 58.6%	HH: 34.1%; Jobs: 44.3%	HH: 38.5%/27.8%; Jobs: 53.5%/43.2%
B3: Street connectivity (# of intersections/square mile, 2005)	Mobility Atlas + Metro TAZ modeling output			104	26	51	273	23	116	95	42	53/21
B4: Bicycle Network Gap -- length of gap (feet) per household, 2005)	Mobility Atlas			158,241	70,979	38,018	124,363	105,069	231,220	77,635	187,113	249,914/16,950
B5: Traffic volumes on corridor throughways and arterials	Mobility Atlas (Ranking)			3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
C: Equity												
C1: Number of low-income, senior and disabled, and minority and/or Hispanic population in corridor	Census 2000			7,035	3,059	771	8,661	1,509	8,442	5,913	5,731	25,094/7,440
D: Economy (includes system performance as well as economic indicators)												
D1: Congestion (volume to capacity ratios for regional throughways and arterial streets (2005)	ODOT DATA			3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	3
D2: Safety (# of top accident locations, SPIS data 2007)	ODOT DATA			3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	3
D3: Total corridor households (2005)	Metro TAZ Modeling output			78,914	36,720	21,707	59,158	1	3	2	2	3/1
D4: Total corridor households (2035)	Metro TAZ Modeling output			116,916	78,663	49,731	103,104	1	2	1	1	1.5
D5: Total corridor jobs (2005)	Metro TAZ Modeling output			131,549	62,534	51,804	259,746	1	2	1	1	2/1
D6: Total corridor jobs (2035)	Metro TAZ Modeling output			219,370	119,504	102,717	374,445	1	2	1	2	3/1
D7: Freight volume (trucks) as percentage of total volume - 2005 (highest % of total) (0-5% = 1; 6-10% = 2; > 10=3)	Mobility Atlas			10.20%	16.20%	9.20%	9.70%	11.20%	7.90%	9.70%	3.40%	1.9%(7.1% NW Zion Church)
E: Local Commitment and Support												
[INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, DUE NOVEMBER 2, 2009]												
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support	Letter											
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration	Letter											
E3: Compatible with locally adopted land use & transportation plans (need for land use certainty; need to support local aspirations)	Letter											
E4: Commitment to monetary or in-kind support of refinement plan	Letter											

Technical Factors

Qualitative Considerations

Discussion Item #4 Attachment 2

Page 2 RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION MATRIX - DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION (October 26, 2009)															
Rankings are Low Med High	Description	Portland Central City to Wilsonville, including Tiegard- Sherwood/Newberg/Tualatin, including I-5 South				Portland Central City Loop, including I-5/L405 Downtown Loop		Clark County to I-5 Via Gateway, Oregon City and Tualatin, including I-205				Cities of East Multnomah County to Damasus (I-84/US 26 Connection)		Beaverton to Forest Grove (Tualatin Valley Highway)	
Mobility Corridors Involved		2, 3 and 20				4		7, 8 and 9				15		24	
		Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 20	Score	Corridor 4	Score	Corridor 7	Corridor 8	Corridor 9	Score	Corridor 15	Score	Data from Corridors 22/23	Score
A: Consistency with State and Regional Plans/Policies															
A1: Previous refinement plan ratings/ranking (2001) <small>INFORMATION ONLY-not included in scores</small>		3	2	1	2.0	0	0.0	2	2	2	2	1	1.0	2	2.0
A2: Previous refinement plan prioritization ratings/ranking (2005)		2	3	3	2.7	3	3.0	3	2	2	2.3	3	3.0	1	1.0
A3: Support Region 2040 (# of primary land uses in corridor - PDX CBD, Regional Centers, Industrial Centers, Freight/Passenger intermodal)		Corridors considered together				2.0	2.0	Corridors considered together				3	2.0	1	1.0
A4: High Capacity Transit Plan ranking		Corridors considered together				3.0	0.0	Corridors considered together				2	1	2	2
A5: Regional Freight Plan consistency		Corridors considered together				3.0	3.0	Corridors considered together				2	3	1	1
B: Environment															
B1: Pedestrian network gap (% of sidewalks in pedestrian districts/corridors, 2005) <small><34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1</small>		2	1	2	1.7	1	1.6	2	2	2	2.0	2	2.0	2/3	2.5
B2: Transit coverage (% of households/% of jobs covered by 15 min transit service, 2005) <small><34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1</small>		3/2	3/3	3/3	2.8	1/1	1.0	3/2	2/2	1/2	2.0	2/2	2	HH (2/1) Jobs (2/2)	1.8
B3: Street connectivity (# of intersections/square mile, 2005)		3	3	3	3.0	1	1.0	3	2	2	2.3	42	3	3/3	3.0
B4: Bicycle Network Gap -- length of gap (feet) per household, 2005)		2	2	2	2.0	2	2.0	3	2	2	2.3	3	3	2/3	2.5
B5: Traffic volumes on corridor throughways and arterials		3	3	3	3.0	3	3.0	3	3	2	2.7	2	2	2	2
C: Equity															
C1: Number of low-income, senior and disabled, and minority and/or Hispanic population in corridor		2	1	1	1.3	2	2.0	1	2	2	1.7	2	2	3/2	2.5
D: Economy (includes system performance as well as economic indicators)															
D1: Congestion (volume to capacity ratios for regional throughways and arterial streets (2005)		3	3	2	2.7	3	3.0	2	3	3	2.7	1	1	3	3
D2: Safety (# of top accident locations, SPIS data 2007)		3	3	3	3.0	3	3	2	3	3	2.7	1	1	3	3
D3: Total corridor households (2005)		3	2	1	2.0	2	2.0	1	3	2	2.0	2	2.0	3/1	2.0
D4: Total corridor households (2035)		2	2	1	1.7	3	3.0	1	2	1	1.3	1	1.0	1.5	1.5
D5: Total corridor jobs (2005)		2	1	1	1.3	3	3.0	1	2	1	1.3	1	2.0	2/1	1.5
D6: Total corridor jobs (2035)		2	2	1	1.7	3	3.0	1	2	1	1.3	2	2.0	3/1	2.0
D7: Freight volume (trucks) as percentage of total volume - 2005 (highest % of total) (0-5% = 1; 6-10% = 2; > 10=3)		3	3	2	2.7	2	2.0	3	2	2	2.3	1	1	1/2	1.5
SUBTOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES					39.5		37.6				36.0		33.0		33.8
E: Local Commitment and Support [INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, DUE NOVEMBER 2, 2009]															
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support															
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration															
E3: Compatible with locally adopted land use & transportation plans (need for land use certainty; need to support local aspirations)															
E4: Commitment to monetary or in-kind support of refinement plan															
SUBTOTAL--LOCAL SUPPORT & COMMITMENT SCORES					0.0		0.0				0.0		0.0		0.0
GRAND TOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES															
					39.5		37.6				36.0		33.0		33.8

I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations


How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?

Background:

1. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was unable at the end of its process to reach a unanimous recommendation for the I-5/99W Corridor Study as required by the PSC Partnership Agreement in order to forward a Recommended Corridor Alternative to the RTP. However, there was unanimous agreement on some aspects of the Connector that could be reflected in the RTP:
 - Identify projects for inclusion in the RTP with minimal extra conditions, particularly the extension of SW 124th from SW Tualatin Sherwood Road to the I-5/North Wilsonville Interchange,
 - Identify conditions to be met before a new Southern Arterial is implemented to ensure integration with surrounding land use and transportation plans, particularly an I-5 South Corridor Study,
 - Determine an incremental phasing plan to ensure the projects with the most benefit that can reasonably be built within the 20-year horizon be included in the RTP Financially Constrained list.

2. The recommendation for the I-5/99W Corridor Study proposed for inclusion in the RTP are based upon the conclusions reached by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) as follows:
 - The 3 options consisting of a new limited access expressway from I-5 to OR 99W (2 alignments north of Sherwood and 1 alignment south of Sherwood) were unacceptable due to high impact on the natural and built environment, the need for extensive improvements to I-5, high cost and concern about the potential for induced growth to Yamhill County, and
 - The option focused on expanding Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. was unacceptable due to the very large size it would need to be and the resulting impacts on the Tualatin and Sherwood Town Centers.
 - The alternative recommended is based upon the principle that it is preferable to spread the traffic across three smaller arterials rather than one large expressway. The analysis concluded this approach could effectively serve the traffic demand, would provide better service to urban land uses in the Tualatin/Sherwood area, especially industrial lands, and could be built incrementally based upon need to serve growth and revenue availability. The overall concept is structured around a Northern, Central and Southern arterial providing east-west access between OR 99W and I-5 with an extension of SW 124th providing north-south connectivity (see diagram below).

The RTP document released September 15 included the recommendation of the Project Steering Committee (approved on a 6-2 vote). The full transmittal from the Project Steering Committee is reflected in Appendix 3 of the draft document (including recommended projects and conditions). In addition, the draft RTP includes changes to the Arterial and Throughway Network Map to reflect the network of arterials rather than a major expressway. Finally, the project list includes most of the recommended projects.



3. The City of Wilsonville was and continues to raise objections to the Southern Arterial component throughout this process. They are very concerned about I-5 congestion continuing to grow and are very dependent on effective access to their two interchanges. They are concerned that the Southern Arterial connecting into the I-5/North Wilsonville interchange will significantly increase traffic and impair their access.
4. When the PSC considered the recommendation, the Clackamas County Commission representative introduced a series of amendments to the conditions to ensure that the Southern Arterial would be examined in greater detail to:
 - evaluate alignment options and their environmental impact,
 - integrate the proposal with the concept plan and transportation system plan for the newly expanded UGB area and any new Urban Reserves that are designated in the area,
 - address any requirements that may result from adoption of an exception to Goal 14 (if needed) for an urban facility outside the UGB,
 - integrate the proposal with an I-5 South Corridor Study (Corridor #3) to ensure these east-west arterials and I-5 itself could effectively function together, and
 - determine the most appropriate approach to connecting the Southern Arterial to I-5, including options for an interchange at the I-5/North Wilsonville interchange or consideration of extending the Southern Arterial across I-5 to Stafford Road east of I-5, thereby providing better access to I-205.

The PSC approved the proposed conditions unanimously.

5. The RTP document released September 15 included the recommendation of the Project Steering Committee (approved on a 6-2 vote). The full transmittal from the Project Steering Committee Chair is reflected in Appendix 3 of the draft document (including recommended projects and conditions). In addition, the draft RTP includes changes to the Arterial and Throughway Network Map to reflect the network of arterials rather than a major expressway. Finally, the project list includes most of the recommended projects.
6. At the October 8 JPACT meeting, the representative from Clackamas County indicated that they could not vote to support adoption of the RTP if it includes the Southern Arterial in the project list without the conditions approved by the Project Steering Committee. Since the intent of the draft RTP released September 15 was to reflect the recommendation as incorporated in Appendix 3, staff will propose amendments to the text of the RTP to fully recognize the approved conditions.

ISSUES:

1. The Project Steering Committee did not reach unanimous agreement on the Recommended Alternative to forward to the RTP. However, there was unanimous agreement on some projects.
2. The 3-Arterial network approach to traffic circulation is dependent upon spreading the traffic across the full system to ensure no single east-west route becomes the *de facto* connector route. Because of traffic problems on OR 99W through Tigard, Tualatin-Sherwood Road is currently functioning as the connector and the City of Tualatin is looking for relief, especially through their Town Center. Sherwood believes that the southern arterial will provide sorely needed access to I-5 for their city. Conversely, the City of Wilsonville is concerned that the Southern Arterial will instead become the connector and the problem will just shift south and have severe impacts on Wilsonville and its Town Center. A solution that incrementally phases segments of all three east-west arterials is dependent upon a long-term agreement between these jurisdictions since the different segments are located in so many different jurisdictions. At present, there is concern that if one of the arterials is improved the other party will not follow through with their parts.
3. The Project Steering Committee acknowledged many significant issues to be addressed before the Southern Arterial can proceed to construction. Typically, there is a need to transition from a “planning” level of detail to a “project” level of detail which involves better definition of alignments and designs and consideration of impacts on the natural and built environment and how to mitigate those impacts. These conditions proposed by the Project Steering Committee add in the need to integrate the recommendation with land use planning for recent UGB expansion areas and potential Urban Reserves (still to be defined) and the importance of integrating the overall system for the area with an I-5 corridor strategy.
4. If the Southern Arterial is dropped, either now or through future studies, there is a major unresolved issue addressing east-west travel through this area. Tualatin-Sherwood Road is sized in the recommended alternative based upon the expectation there will be a Southern Arterial and will fail due to insufficient capacity without a Southern Arterial and further expansion is incompatible with the plans for the Tualatin and Sherwood Town Centers.

5. The Herman Road/Tualatin Road direct connection to the I-5/Lower Boones Ferry Road interchange is proposed by the City of Tualatin as a 2-lane Minor Arterial, not a 4-lane Major Arterial. If the Southern Arterial is dropped there will be more traffic demand than this size arterial can carry and increasing the size is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and natural features.
6. Public Process – Throughout the I-5/99W Connector Study process there was considerable public outreach. It covered all the steps, including:
 - a. Definition of the problem
 - b. Determination of values/goals/objectives/evaluation criteria
 - c. Definition of the alternatives to be evaluated
 - d. Evaluation of Alternatives

The last major outreach step was to obtain public input on the 6 alternatives evaluated. The recommended alternative was essentially assembling various elements of the other 6 alternatives into a hybrid. It carried forward bike, trail, pedestrian and transit improvements from the TDM alternative; it carried forward a Tualatin-Sherwood and Herman Road extension from the alternative designed to expand upon the existing system but as smaller facilities; it brought forward a Southern Arterial from Alternative 6 but with a reduced scale (as an arterial rather than an expressway). Public input was received on Alternatives 1-6 and development of Alternative 7 through a variety of mechanisms up to and including the final Project Steering Committee meeting in February, 2009.

The Project Steering Committee could not reach consensus on the recommendation, voted to submit it to the RTP on a 6-2 vote and disbanded. Their conclusions took into account the input received and recognized that future public involvement would occur in addressing the conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Add a section to the RTP describing the overall concept of the three arterial recommendation. In the description recognize the intent to spread the traffic demand across this network of arterials that are phased in to ensure no single arterial functions as the *defacto* through traffic “connector” and that are phased in based upon incrementally expanding the arterial network tied to growth in the surrounding area being served. Include in the overall description the conditions that must be addressed.
2. Revise the Project List (as revised and shown in Attachment 2) as follows:
 - a. Include the conditions as part of the project description for the Southern Arterial with language that implementation will not proceed unless and until the conditions are met;
 - b. Shift the timing of the Southern Arterial right-of-way acquisition from the 2008-2017 time period to the 2018-2025 time period to recognize there needs to be sufficient time to address the conditions (Project #10598);
 - c. Shift the right-of-way acquisition for the Southern Arterial out of the Financially Constrained funding level (Project #10598);
 - d. Modify the description of the SW 124th extension to reflect a 2-3 lane project (Project #10736) from SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road to the vicinity of SW Tonquin

Road, then east to SW Boones Ferry Road, then south to the I-5/North Wilsonville interchange; define the needed improvements to the full length of this project sufficient to support its operation as an industrial access route; ensure construction of the full length is on a coordinated schedule.

- e. Amend project #10731 to be described as a two-lane minor arterial bridge, amend Figure 2.10 to designate this new connection as a community street and amend Figure 2.12 to designation this new connection as a minor arterial, consistent with the City of Tualatin's adopted plans and development code. Consistent with the I-5/99W Project Steering Committee recommendation and conditions, this route is not intended to serve through traffic, but rather is intended to provide access to the surrounding industrial area and neighborhoods.
3. Amend Figure 2.10 to remove the minor arterial designation on Tualatin Rd. between Herman Rd. and OR 99W. This designation was made in error since it is intended to function as a collector. The section of Tualatin Road between Herman Road and OR 99W is classified as a major collector in Tualatin's city development code and should not be classified as a regional street in Figure 2.10 of the draft RTP. The current design is the city's long-term plan for this street - two lanes with a center turn lane, planter strip, sidewalks and bike lanes. This is consistent with the study recommendations.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED:

1. As an alternative to including the recommendation in the RTP, it could be referred back to the Project Steering Committee with the requirement to seek public input on the recommended alternative. This is not recommended because public involvement in the follow-on steps will be required and will be more focused if built upon adoption of this recommendation in the RTP.
2. Also, as an alternative to including the Southern Arterial in the RTP, it could be removed pending satisfaction of the conditions. If this approach is taken, proposed improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road and the Tualatin Road extension to the I-5/Lower Boones Ferry Interchange should also be removed from the RTP because of the inter-related nature of these improvements. If this action is taken, there would be an added Corridor Refinement Plan called for to address the east-west travel demand between I-5 and OR 99W.

Regional Transportation Plan Discussion Item #5 Attachment 1

At their meeting on February 25, 2009, the PSC agreed on the following conditions as amended from those presented to them in the Alternative 7 Recommendation Memorandum dated February 17, 2009 to accompany the RTP recommendation of Alternative 7:

1. **Future phasing plans for implementing Alternative 7 projects must take into consideration the transportation, environmental, and economic impacts of advancing some improvements sooner than others.** The sequencing of affordable improvements should be done in a manner that does not create new transportation problems or liabilities for the vitality of affected jurisdictions.
 2. **The timing and priority of an I-5 corridor study must be considered in the RTP adoption process for Alternative 7.** The connector project development process emphasized the need for a corridor study along I-5 from Portland to the Willamette River. The results of this study may affect the timing and designs of some improvements within Alternative 7.
 3. **Access between I-5 and the southern arterial must be resolved.** Additional study is required to fully understand the impacts and trade offs between transportation solutions and land use, economic and environmental consequences of a new southern arterial. The impacts on rural lands are of particular importance and must be further evaluated before pursuing an exceptions process. The study area may need to be expanded to include connections to Stafford Road and additional areas along the OR 99W corridor that were not included in the alternatives analysis. The alternatives analysis process determined the general corridor location for the new southern arterial. However, additional preliminary engineering and planning work is needed to determine the optimal access option and configuration for connecting the southern arterial to I-5, OR 99W, and other arterials in the expanded study area. Construction of the southern arterial should be conditioned on defining the I-5 improvements needed to accommodate it and ensuring no negative impacts to I-5 and I-205 occur beyond the forecast No-Build condition as a result of Alternative 7. Options to be explored include modifying the I-5/North Wilsonville Interchange into a tight split-diamond interchange, or extending a new arterial connection crossing over I-5 and connecting to Stafford Road and/or Elligsen Road on the east side of I-5 for regional traffic benefits.
 4. **Completion and construction of major project elements is subject to compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and design refinement.** The Alternative 7 concept provides only the general locations and functional characteristics of new transportation facilities. A fully collaborative public/agency involvement and environmental analysis process must be conducted in developing the design details of any major construction element of Alternative 7. Subsequent project development work will need to define the actual alignments and designs of each of these facilities within the framework of these general parameters. On-going coordination with the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge must also occur to ensure optimum compatibility of Alternative 7 elements with refuge objectives.
 5. **Land Use Concept Planning for UGB expansion areas should be coordinated with the refinement of these transportation recommendations.**
 6. **The design of the southern arterial; must incorporate any conditions that may come out of land use goal exceptions processes (if required) by Metro, Washington County, and Clackamas County.** Portions of Alternative 7 may require exceptions under state land use goals that have not yet been studied or approved in order to be adopted in the RTP and to achieve needed federal and jurisdictional approvals. The extent of this issue may be affected by Metro's coming decisions on rural/urban land use reserves. Portions of proposed new transportation facilities are outside Metro's jurisdictional boundaries and will require coordination of actions between Metro and other affected jurisdictions. Possible design requirements may include forms of access management and land use control measures.
 7. **State highway system routing and ODOT mobility standards must be key considerations in the design and future ownership of improvements within Alternative 7.** Current RTP assumptions are that a new limited-access connector would be built between I-5 and 99W, and that this roadway would become the new state route, possibly replacing OR 99W through Tigard. Alternative 7 does not result in
-

a limited-access connector, which may result in OR 99W remaining the designated state highway route through Sherwood, King City and Tigard.

8. **Strategic protection of right-of-way should be considered by agencies for the Alternative 7 elements within the UGB and along potential alignments where land development could conflict with the future implementation of corridor improvements.** Protective measures could include property setbacks, dedication of right-of-way, specific acquisition(s), and/or right-of-way purchases within the UGB consistent with NEPA process.

Following agreement on the above conditions, PSC representatives of Washington County, ODOT, Metro, and the cities of Tualatin and Sherwood voted in favor of recommending Alternative 7 with the conditions as amended above. PSC representatives of the City of Wilsonville and Clackamas County voted against this recommendation.

**DRAFT 2035 RTP Project List
I-5/99W Connector Study Projects**

October 28, 2009

Metro Project ID	Nominating Agency	Facility Owner / Operator	Project/Program Name	Project Start Location	Project End Location	Local Functional Classification	Project Purpose	Description	Estimated Cost (\$2007)	Time Period	Federal FC Priorities
10092	Wilsonville		Tonquin Trail	Washington/Clackamas County line	Boones Ferry Landing	Other	Regional trail would connect Tualatin/Sherwood with west Wilsonville, Coffe Lake Natural Area. Connections to the trail will be provided at Wilsonville road, through Villebois, Boeckman Road, Cahalin Road.	Shared use path with some on-street portions.	\$3,000,000	2008-2017	X
10568	Washington Co.	Washington Co.	Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. Improvements	OR 99W	Teton Ave.	Arterial	Provide congestion relief.	Widen from three to five lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks.	\$49,150,000	2018-2025	X
10603	Washington Co.	Washington Co.	Tualatin-Sherwood Rd. ATMS	I-5	Teton Ave.	Arterial	Provide congestion relief.	Install integrated surveillance and management equipment.	\$1,594,000	2008-2017	X
10700	Sherwood	Sherwood	Arrow Street (Herman Road)	Adams Ave	Gerda Ln/Herman Road Extension	TBD	Economic development.	Construct road to collector standards.	\$8,190,000	2018-2025	X
10708	Washington Co.	Washington Co.	Roy Rogers Rd.	OR 99W	Borchers Dr	Arterial	Economic development and address safety issues.	Construct road to 5 lane collector standard.	\$1,900,000	2018-2025	X
10715	Tualatin	Tualatin	Herman	Teton	Tualatin	Local	Freight movement.	Reconstruct and widen to 3 lanes from Teton to Tualatin.	\$2,500,000	2008-2017	X
10718	Tualatin	Tualatin	Herman	Cipole	124th Ave	Local	Economic development and freight movement.	Reconstruction from Cipole to 124th.	\$4,100,000	2008-2017	X
10731	Tualatin	Tualatin	Tualatin Rd/Lower Boones Ferry Rd	Herman Rd/Tualatin Rd intersection	Exit 290 at I 5	Minor Arterial	Congestion relief and employment/industrial access	Complete project development and begin construction of the <u>two-lane</u> connection of Tualatin Road from Herman Rd intersection to I-5 at Lower Boones Ferry Road (Exit 290). Consider alternative alignments including the existing route and bridge across the Tualatin River and potential new routes and bridges across the Tualatin River. Consider additional freeway crossing capacity in the vicinity of the I-5/Lower Boones Ferry Road interchange.	\$44,900,000	2018-2025	
10732	Tualatin	Tualatin	Boones Ferry	Norwood	Day	Minor Arterial		Widen to 5 lanes from Norwood to Day Rd.	\$40,050,000	2018-2025	
10735	Tualatin	Tualatin	Herman	108th	Teton	Local	Economic development and freight movement.	Widen to 5 lanes from 108th to Teton.	\$1,250,000	2018-2025	X
10736	Tualatin	Tualatin	124th Ave	Tualatin-Sherwood	I-5/North Wilsonville Interchange	Minor Arterial	Economic development and freight movement.	Construct a 2-3 lane extension of SW 124th (allow for future expansion to 5 lanes as growth requires) from Tualatin-Sherwood Road to approximately SW Tonquin Rd, then east to SW Boones Ferry Road; determine needed improvements to SW Boones Ferry Road south to and including the I-5/North Stafford Interchange	\$72,000,000	2008-2017	X
10743	Tualatin	Tualatin	99W	City Limits	City limits	Major Arterial	Complete gap in system.	Install sidewalks from Cipole to Tualatin River.	\$10,400,000	2026-2035	
10852	Wilsonville	ODOT	95th/Boones Ferry/Commerce Circle Intersection Improvements	95th Ave.	Southbound off-ramp of I-5/Stafford Interchange	Major Arterial	Reduce congestion & improve freight access into regionally significant industrial lands	Construct dual left-turn and right-turn lanes; improve signal synchronization, access management & sight-distance	\$2,500,000	2008-2017	X
10854	Metro	To be determined	Tonquin Trail	Tualatin-Sherwood Rd.	Clackamas Co. Line	NA	Connect Tualatin area with Coffee Creek Natural Area, Toquin Geologic Area & Grahams Oak Natural Area	Construct multiuse trail with some on-street segments connecting multiple communities in Washington and Clackamas County. Targeted as metro Strategic Investment priority.	\$3,000,000	2008-2017	X
10872	ODOT	ODOT	Add lane: SB I-205 to SB I-5 interchange ramp and extend acceleration lane and add auxiliary lane on SB I-5 to Elligsen Road.	I-205	Elligsen Road	Interstate	Significant localized congestion occurs at the merge point of the I-205 SB ramp connection to SB I-5. This has prompted concerns that the anticipated benefits of scheduled construction of a permanent auxiliary lane in each direction on I-205, between I-5.	Add lane to SB I-205 to SB I-5 interchange ramp and extend acceleration lane and add auxiliary lane on SB I-5 to Elligsen Road.	\$9,700,000	2008-2017	X
11177	ODOT	ODOT	I-5 northbound auxiliary lane from Elligsen Road interchange to I-205 interchange	Elligsen Rd	I-205	Interstate	Relieve congestion.	Construct northbound auxiliary lane on I-5 between Elligsen Road interchange and I-205 interchange.	\$11,000,000	2008-2017	X

RTP Discussion Item #5 - ATTACHMENT 2

**DRAFT 2035 RTP Project List
I-5/99W Connector Study Projects**

October 28, 2009

Metro Project ID	Nominating Agency	Facility Owner / Operator	Project/Program Name	Project Start Location	Project End Location	Local Functional Classification	Project Purpose	Description	Estimated Cost (\$2007)	Time Period	Federal FC Priorities
11179	ODOT	ODOT	I-5 to 99W replacement projects	N/A	N/A	N/A	Improve statewide mobility and access to Portland metropolitan area.	Construct improvements consistent with recommendations from I-5/99W connector process.	\$10,000,000	2008-2017	X
10598	Washington Co.		I-5/99W Southern Arterial ROW	OR 99W	I-5	Arterial	Provide congestion relief.	Purchase right-of-way when project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordination with and I-5 Corridor Study and resolution of access between I-5 and southern arterial with no negative impacts to I-5 and I-205 beyond the forecast No-Build condition, addressing NEPA to determine the preferred alignment and addressing any conditions associated with land use goal exception for southern arterial	\$90,000,000	2018-2025	
11339	Washington Co.		I-5/99W Southern Arterial Improvements: Phase 1	OR 99W	124th Ave. Extension	Arterial	Provide congestion relief.	Construct the initial 2-3 lane phase of the Southern Arterial from Hwy 99W to the SW 124th Extension when project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordination with and I-5 Corridor Study and resolution of access between I-5 and southern arterial with no negative impacts to I-5 and I-205 beyond the forecast No-Build condition, addressing NEPA to determine the preferred alignment and addressing any conditions associated with land use goal exception for southern arterial	\$130,000,000	2018-2025	
11340	Washington Co.		I-5/99W Southern Arterial Improvements: Phase 2	OR 99W	I-5	Arterial	Provide congestion relief.	Expand to 4-5 lanes to serve growth in the area after improvements to Tualatin-Sherwood Road and an improved connection from Sw Tualatin Road to the I-5/Lower Boones Ferry Interchange and when project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordination with and I-5 South Corridor Study and resolution of access between I-5 and southern arterial with no negative impacts to I-5 and I-205 beyond the forecast No-Build condition, addressing NEPA to determine the preferred alignment and addressing any conditions associated with land use goal exception for southern arterial	\$80,000,000	2026-2035	
11342	Washington Co.		I-5/99W Southern Arterial/I-5 Interface	South Arterial@ I-5		Arterial	Improve access to and from the Southern Arterial and I-5	Connect the Southern Arterial to I-5 or other surface arterials in the vicinity of the I-5/North Wilsonville Interchange when project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordination with and I-5 South Corridor Study and resolution of access between I-5 and southern arterial with no negative impacts to I-5 and I-205 beyond the forecast No-Build condition, addressing NEPA to determine the preferred alignment and addressing any conditions associated with land use goal exception for southern arterial	\$50,000,000	2026-2035	

2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations - DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(comments received September 15 through October 15, 2009 and subsequent Metro Advisory Committee discussions)

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Public Review Draft and regional plans for freight, transportation system management and operations and high capacity transit were released for public review from September 15 – October 15, 2009. This document summarizes recommended changes received in writing, at Metro Council public hearings and during discussions of the Metro Council and Metro advisory committees as part of the public comment period. This section includes recommended changes and policy issues identified for further discussion prior to action.

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
1	Performance targets	<p>Performance Targets "Memorable and Aggressive Performance Targets: It is absolutely essential that there are well-defined, easily memorable, performance targets that drive our entire transportation investment strategy. The JPACT endorsed targets are a good start. However more clarity is needed on how they relate to the "Recommended System Evaluation Measures" on pg. 4 and the "RTP System Monitoring Performance Measures" on pg 5. Some of the primary reasons for setting targets and measuring performance are to make sure decision-makers understand what we're moving toward, how we're measuring it, and where we stand in meeting the target.</p> <p>Tracking the Target Direction is Not Enough Rather than measuring the target direction, we should be measuring the actual progress we're making toward meeting our targets. Otherwise the process does not provide enough discipline to ensure movement toward overall goals.</p> <p>Resources for Performance Monitoring: An outcomes based investment approach requires time and financial resources to monitor and adjust strategies based on performance over time. Actual travel data needs to be collected, rather than relying on the regional model. Furthermore, resources need to be committed to analyze the data.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	No change needed. See Discussion item #2
2	Performance targets	Add a performance target for freight reliability, such as reducing hours of delay on the freight network, which would help reduce the cost of congestion on the economy.	MTAC	10/21/09, 10/23/09	Amend as requested. See Discussion item #2
3	Performance targets	MPAC discussed this the climate change performance target and recommended that "transportation-related" be added to the target to be clear this is focused on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.	MPAC	10/23/09	Amend as requested. See Discussion item #2

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
4	Performance targets	MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff to consider whether the target should be to triple the share of trips made by each mode of travel instead of the number of trips made by each mode. MPAC also recommended that targets should be set for each mode rather than as an aggregate as proposed. Staff recommends the target be revised to call for tripling the share of trips made by walking, bicycling and transit.	MPAC	10/23/09	Amend as requested. See Discussion item #2
5	Performance targets	MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff to consider whether the target should be more aggressive given the connection of reducing VMT per person to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Federal legislation has called for a 16 percent reduction in VMT per person given forecasted growth in population and economic activity, which will result in continued growth in overall VMT in the region.	MPAC	10/23/09	No change recommended. This should be considered as part of the climate change scenarios work that follows the RTP update. See Discussion item #2.
6	Performance targets	The affordability target should be revised to call for a reduction in the percent of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income on housing and transportation combined.	MTAC, Metro Council, MPAC	10/21/09, 10/21/09, 10/23/09	Amend as requested. See Discussion item #2
7	Performance targets	The access to daily needs target should be revised to include "trails" and "sidewalks" and to report the information at a regional-level as well as for traditionally disadvantaged populations. MPAC recognized the importance of tracking progress toward improving access and the number of transportation options available to low-income and minority populations, but also felt it was important to improve access and options for everyone.	MPAC	10/23/09	Amend as requested. . An equity analysis will help ensure low-income and minority populations share in the benefits of transportation investments without bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. The analysis will also help the region meet federal Civil Rights and environmental justice policies through the long-range transportation planning process. See Discussion item #2
8	Corridor refinement plans	Support for prioritizing completion of Barbur/99W/Sherwood/I-5 corridor refinement plan.	Wilsonville Chamber of comerce, Sysco, Xerox, Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.	10/14/09, 10/15/09, 10/15/09, 10/15/09	See Discussion item #4

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
9	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Prioritize completion of I-84 to US 26 connector study. Interstate 84 to US 26 is a primary access route linking East Multnomah County and the Portland Metro region with Damascus and key commercial and recreational centers within Oregon such as Bend and Mt. Hood. Currently four roads provide options for north-south travel through and within East County: 181st, 202nd, 238th/242nd/Hogan Road, and 257th/Kane Road. Of these roads, not one is a defined route to service north-south travel. In addition, not one of them was designed to accommodate all of the projected 2035 traffic volumes as modeled in the RTP. A Corridor Refinement Plan (CRP) is necessary to determine what improvements can be made to most effectively manage and accommodate existing and projected traffic demands within and through this corridor for all modes, including but not limited to freight and transit.</p> <p>Historically, regional support for an I-84 to US 26 study has been strong and it was identified as a top priority for the region in the most recent RTP. Within East County there is consensus for the need for a CRP; the Mayors of the four East County cities (Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village) have adopted a Memorandum of Understanding that recognizes the critical importance of improving north-south travel.</p>	<p>City of Damascus, Kelley Creek Neighborhood Area and Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations, Gresham Transportation Committee, East Multnomah County Transportation Committee, Multnomah County, City of Gresham,</p>	<p>9/15/09, 10/1/09, 10/1/09, 10/5/09, 10/15/09, 10/15/09</p>	See Discussion item #4
10	Project	<p>Figure 2.10 on page 94 of Chapter 2 of the draft RTP, designates the section of Tualatin Rd. between Herman Rd. and OR 99W as a "Regional Street", which is illustrated on pg. 31 of Chapter 2 the draft plan as "4 lanes".</p>	Bethany Wurtz	9/30/09	See Discussion item #5
11	Project	<p>Do not support project #10731 - Tualatin Rd./Lower Boones Ferry Rd. (northern arterial). As proposed, it would increase the width of Herman Road and Tualatin Road; it will also cross over Tualatin Community Park and the Tualatin River. Many comments raised concerns that this connection would be a highway connection - and funnel significant volumes of traffic through existing neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Kathy Newcomb, Carol Cesnalis, Dian Leth, Robert L. and Frances M. Barnes, Dwight Raikoglo, Jeanne Raikoglo, Toni Anderson, Nicole Ingram, Laura White, Marilyn D. Perry, Pat Carroll, Charlie Goodson, Rod Mai, Saari Mai, Glenn Bailey, Linda Russell, David scoutx@gmail.com (no last name provided), Helen : Crimesucks@aol.com (no last name provided), Bethany Wurtz, Marianne Germond, Delores Hurtado</p>	<p>10/8/2009 - 10/15/2009</p>	See Discussion item #5

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
12	Project	Do not support northern arterial due to Tualatin community parks impacts.	Lyn Glover, Ed Casey, Marlene Reischman, Beth Roach, Sarah Draper, Lori Sierhuis, Beverly Robinson, Mark and Stacey Taft, Candice Kelly, Chris Hein, Stacey Swanson, Carl Rumpf, Diane H. Barry, James Sullivan, Rowena and Randy Hill, Martha Bailey, Brad Parker, Shelby & Jon Peterson, Richard & Mary Neely, Phillipa Peach, Christine Nyberg Tunstall	10/2/2009 - 10/15/2009	See Discussion item #5
13	Project	Do not support central arterial due to increased traffic impacts on downtown Tualatin/adjacent neighborhoods, and would divide city.	Lyn Glover, Ed Casey, Beth Roach, Sarah Draper, Lori Sierhuis, Beverly Robinson, Mark and Stacey Taft, Candice Kelly, Chris Hein, Carl Rumpf, Diane H. Barry, Phillipa Peach, Bethany Wurtz	10/2/09	See Discussion item #5
14	Project	Please remove projects 10598, 11339, 11340, and 11342 that relate to Southern Arterial as part of Alternative 7 of the I-5/99W study recommendation due to environmental, community and traffic impacts.	Michael Feves, Anne Voegtlin, Darren McCarthy, Jeffrey Kleinman, John Broome, Mayor Tim Knapp, City of Wilsonville, Cara Hollock, Joan Steinfeld, Barb Belknap, Shelby Crecraft, Citizens for Farmland Preservation	10/13/2009 - 10/15/2009	See Discussion item #5
15	Project	Supportive of all three arterial proposals (Northern, Central and Southern) through Tualatin with the following condition that all would be designed as 4 lane with landscaped median strip (or 5 lane) and limited and/or controlled access to prohibit left turn movements.	Joe Lipscomb	10/5/09	See Discussion item #5
16	Project	Supportive of all three arterial proposals with approved conditions (Northern, Central and Southern)	Steve Gilmore, Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce, Sysco PAC/WEST, City of Sherwood, City of Sherwood Chamber of Commerce, Clarence and Pam Langer, Les Schwab Tire Center #259	10/15/09	See Discussion item #5
17	Project	Support for central arterial.	Marlene Reischman, Stacey Swanson, James Sullivan	10/2/09	See Discussion item #5

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
18	Project	Support for southern arterial/124th Ave. extension.	Lyn Glover, Ed Casey, Sarah Draper, Beverly Robinson, Mark and Stacey Taft, Candice Kelly, Stacey Swanson, Diane H. Barry, James Sullivan, Phillipa Peach, Bethany Wurtz, Christine Nyberg Tunstall, Monique Beikman	10/2/2009 - 10/15/2009	See Discussion item #5
19	Project	Not able to support adoption of the RTP if it includes the Southern Arterial in the project list without the conditions approved by the Project Steering Committee.	Clackamas County	10/8/09	See Discussion item #5

 Metro | *Memo*

Date: October 28, 2009
To: TPAC and interested parties
From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Consent Items (Exhibit G)

Exhibit G (Consent Items for Consideration) - The attached comment log identifies proposed amendments to respond to public comments received between September 15 and October 15, 2009. **This exhibit is proposed for approval on a “consent” basis without further discussion. Committee members can request discussion of any of these consent items at the October 30 meeting.**

TPAC is requested to make a recommendation to JPACT on the consent items at the October 30 meeting.

2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations - CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(comments received September 15 through October 15, 2009)

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Public Review Draft and regional plans for freight, transportation system management and operations and high capacity transit were released for public review from September 15 – October 15, 2009. This document summarizes recommended changes to respond to substantive comments received in writing, at Metro Council public hearings and during discussions of the Metro Council and Metro advisory committees as part of the public comment period. This section includes changes that are recommended for approval as a package of consent items without further discussion.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
1	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Prioritize completion of Phase 2 of the Powell/Foster Corridor study. In 2003 a Phase 1 Powell/Foster Corridor Transportation Plan was completed. By Resolution No. 03-3373, Metro approved the recommendations of the Plan, directed staff to prepare amendments to the Plan in accordance with the Phase 1 recommendations, and directed Metro staff to initiate Phase II of the Powell/Foster Corridor Plan.</p> <p>More specifically, with respect to 174th Avenue / Jenne Road, the Recommendations state: "As part of Phase II of the Powell / Foster Corridor Transportation Plan, complete a project development study of a new extension of SE 174th Avenue between Jenne and the future Giese Roads. The study may result in an amendment to planning documents to call for a new extension of SE 174th Avenue in lieu of widening Jenne Road to three lanes between Foster Road and Powell Boulevard." The recommendations state that as next steps, "Metro, the City of Gresham and the City of Portland should consider amending the description of the Powell/Foster Corridor Refinement Plan in the RTP to include, in the short term, a Metro led study of the extension of SE 174th Avenue from Powell Boulevard to SE Giese Road." The implementation of this Phase II work is of critical importance to 2040 implementation in Pleasant Valley, Damascus and the City of Gresham.</p>	Gresham Transportation Committee, City of Gresham	10/1/09, 10/15/2009	Amend draft RTP to document the findings and recommendations from the Powell/Foster corridor study as part of documenting the mobility corridor strategy for this part of the region. The issues raised in the comment are recommended to be addressed through future project development activities.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
2	Corridor refinement plans	Update the corridor refinement plan description of Mobility Corridors 2, 3, and 20 including I-5 South, OR 99W, and OR 43 to be a combined description and to include the following text, <u>"The combined corridor refinement plan allows consideration of a full range of options or solutions to address mobility and other identified needs in the corridor. These include completion of the local and regional/arterial transportation network as well as transit facilities and services, both local and regional (including HCT), and state, if commuter rail or intercity rail are also considered. The full range of highway solutions should be considered from I-405 to the Metro region boundary, including major operational improvements such as ramp improvements, auxiliary lanes and other weaving area improvements in the corridor, as well as truck climbing lanes, general purpose lanes, HOV lanes or priced lanes. Safety improvements that also improve mobility by reducing crashes could include geometric improvements such as improving curves, shoulders and other elements."</u>	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended. The refinement plan descriptions will be further updated in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The comment will be considered as part of that effort and reflect recommendations for the next priority corridor.
3	Corridor refinement plans	Revise Chapter 5, page 11, fourth bullet to remove reference to an interchange at Boeckman Road. ODOT does not believe an interchange at Boeckman Road would meet any ODOT or Metro policy or design needs. Improving the overcrossing may be something useful for Wilsonville local circulation. ODOT is also open to considering a new overcrossing or interchange modifications near the N. Wilsonville interchange to help serve the developing area between Tualatin and Wilsonville.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
4	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Include the following solutions for consideration as part of the future corridor refinement plan: <u>I-5 Improvements – I-405 to North Tigard – Implement safety and modernization improvements defined by the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan.</u></p> <p><u>I-5 improvements - Metro UGB to North Tigard - Implement safety and modernization improvements defined by the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan - assumed to be from north of Barbur Interchange (OR 99W) to south of the Willamette River (Boone Bridge) – in phases totaling over \$600 million.</u></p> <p><u>I-5/OR 217 Interchange Phase 2: SB OR-217/Kruse Way Exit - Complete interchange reconstruction: Braid SB OR 217 exit to I-5 with Kruse Way exit, approximately \$50 million.</u></p> <p><u>I-5/OR-217 Interchange Phase 3: SB OR-217 to I-5 NB Flyover Ramp - Complete interchange reconstruction with new SB OR-217 to NB I-5 flyover ramp - \$30 million</u></p>	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The mobility corridor strategy and updated refinement plan descriptions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The potential solutions will be documented in that effort.
5	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Add the following to the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridor #4 (including I-5 and I-405 in the downtown loop): <u>Planning is underway in the I-84 to I-405 area (Rose Quarter) of the freeway loop system in conjunction with the Portland Plan.</u></p>	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. F91
6	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Add the following to the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridors 7, 8, and 9, including I-205: <u>Adding general purpose lanes to I-205 should be considered to meet state and regional policies, to bring the freeway up to three through lanes in each direction in the southern section from Oregon City to I-5. Interchange improvements, auxiliary lanes and other major operational improvements such as ramp improvements and other weaving area improvements in the corridor should also be considered. Specific projects to be considered to meet identified</u></p>	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The mobility corridor strategy and updated refinement plan descriptions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The potential solutions will be documented in that effort.
7	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Add the following potential solutions to be considered in the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridor 15: <u>All local street improvements, including locally needed connections to I-84 and US 26.</u></p>	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The mobility corridor strategy and updated refinement plan descriptions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The potential solutions will be documented in that effort.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
8	Corridor refinement plans	Add the following potential solutions to be considered in the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridor 24, including TV Highway: Transportation System Management – signal interconnects – from Beaverton to Aloha and Aloha to Hillsboro, over \$4 million; transit service improvements to provide frequent bus service.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The mobility corridor strategy and updated refinement plan descriptions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The potential solutions will be documented in that effort.
9	Corridor refinement plans	Chapter 5, Figure 5-2 should be amended to show that Local/Regional Plan Updates may be required to implement non-refinement plan Mobility Corridor Strategies as well, in cases where the Mobility Corridor Strategy identifies needs for which no specific "solutions" or improvements have been identified.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
10	Corridor refinement plans	Add the following to the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridors 7, 8, and 9, including I-205: <u>Consider widening to 8 lanes from OR 212/224 to I-84, with general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, tolled lanes or express lanes; costs and feasibility to be determined in the refinement plan.</u>	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended. The refinement plan will need to demonstrate that a planned system of 3 lanes each direction, high capacity transit, frequent transit service and other parallel arterial, operational, system and demand management (which includes HOV, tolled lanes or express lanes) solutions do not adequately address transportation needs first, prior to considering widening to 8 lanes.
11	Refinement plans	Add the following problem statement to the description of the I-84/US 26 Connector/Mobility Corridor 15: <u>"A regional corridor refinement plan is necessary to make informed transportation investment decisions that will facilitate the development of underutilized industrial lands and six regional and town centers to foster economic growth, and maintain and enhance the livability of East Metro communities. This planning will result in a long-term strategy that addresses regional transportation needs for the area between 181st/182nd Avenue and 257th/Kane Road. The refinement plan will consider a full range of transportation solutions that support planned land uses and recommend improvements for the connection of I-84 and US 26."</u>	Multnomah County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
12	Existing conditions	Add an RTP project to evaluate the risks to the transportation system associated with a seismic event or landslides that could hamper emergency response; develop a plan to address these issues.	Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc,	10/15/09	No change recommended. This work is already occurring through the Regional Emergency Management Group (REMG) as described in Chapter 1 (pages 36 and 37) of the RTP.
13	Existing conditions	Change title of Table 1.2 (Draft RTP p. 14) as follows: <u>"Oregon Shipments for Top-Tier Commodities, by Weight and Value for 2002 and 2035"</u>	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
14	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 42, bullet 2: "Employer outreach programs to encourage transit use in their workforce." This should be more multi-modal, TDM programs that we run encourage all modes, not just transit.	Portland	10/13/09	Amend to replace "transit" with "multimodal travel choices."
15	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 42, bullet 5: Refers to SmartTrips as TravelSmart, should be SmartTrips. Also says that many cities are doing this, in fact we are the only city running an individualized marketing project at the moment.	Portland	10/13/09	Amend as requested.
16	Existing conditions	Chapter 1: Safe Routes to School is a great program that Metro doesn't contribute to now. Should we expect Metro to support Safe Routes to School in the future if it's in this plan?	Portland	10/13/09	No change recommended at this time. Safe Routes to School is one of the many actions that the region, defined as the broad set of local and regional agencies included in the RTP, supports. The 2008-2013 RTO Strategic Plan lists the marketing and outreach to families including safe routes to school as a priority program area.
17	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 43: The blue box outlines "potential new strategies" for TDM such as HOV lanes, congestion pricing, HOT Lanes...etc. While all effective, these are all highway capacity projects which don't seem to fit the description of what they want to achieve: "a coordinated strategy that links land use and transportation decisions, provides targeted road and highway improvements along with high quality transit service, better transportation options, and system management..." I'd really like to see a better description of how TDM programs and policies can work with these investments in capacity to achieve the goals of the plan. The way it's written it seems like the only important decision is how we manage the freeway system with respect to capacity. This is especially important when considering that non-work travel accounts for as much as 69% of PM peak hour traffic. For example, if the region decides to move forward on congestion pricing or managed lanes we need to offer the public an alternative to paying the tolls; this comes in the form of TDM programs. None of this will exist without funding.	Portland	10/13/09	Amend title of caption box to read "RTP scenarios results point to an integrated solution for <u>managing congestion</u> ".
18	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 48: By saying the plan is addressing the issue of non-work related PM peak traffic through the RTO program (page 48) is an inadequate answer; a large majority of the RTO program goes toward funding employer programs at TriMet and TMAs. The City has received funding for non-employer programs in the past, but the way this plan suggests the problem is solved by having an RTO program is an inadequate effort at addressing what seems to be a rather large issue.	Portland	10/13/09	Amend statement on p. 48 to read "The RTO program made a shift in its 2003 strategic plan to <u>also</u> target non-commute trips during rush hour and throughout the day as a key strategy to congestion and air quality issues.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
19	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 45: In reference to the TDM map, we can include all the Safe Routes schools if they'd like (there are 70). Also, the map does not include the most recent SmartTrips program that covered all of North and NW Portland.	Portland	10/13/09	Amend Figure 1.14 to include safe route to school locations and update Smart Trips individualized marketing areas.
20	Existing Conditions	Update data on bicycle-related industry growth, as Alta has released a 2008 report that updates its 2006 study.	Portland Bureau of Transportation	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
21	Existing Conditions	Update Figure 1.16 Bicycle traffic on Willamette River Bridges and Miles of Bikeways Constructed with more recent chart from Portland Bureau of Transportation website	Portland Bureau of Transportation	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Also, update footnote 52: "Bicycle Count Report, 2006-2008"
22	Existing Conditions	Ch.1, p. 49: There is insufficient discussion and clarity of how the regional trails and greenways network fits into the RTP.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend this section to add text to last paragraph on ch.1, p.49 describing that Figure 1.18 is included to provide context for the regional trails included in the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Network and to better link the RTP to regional parks and greenspaces implementation efforts.
23	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 41: While ITS is important, it is critical that we consider how to shift travel behavior using techniques outside of technology – like pricing parking	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend section to recognize the complement of transportation system management and operation solutions.
24	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, p. 44: Regional TSMO Plan Map only shows road solutions. It should be updated to represent all elements of the plan or it should be renamed to "road elements of the TSMO plan" and another map, table, or graphic introduced to cover the rest.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend Figure 1.13 legend title to read "ITS Corridor Investments Existing System"
25	Existing conditions	Table 1.2 is very confusing, as the order of the goods being compared changes.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Table 1.2 presents commodities shipped within Oregon, from Oregon and to Oregon, in terms of tons and value. The composition of those goods differs and is reflected in the table.
26	Existing conditions	Table 1.3 is not consistent with Figure 1.5, text describing the differences is warranted. The labels are confusing, for example what does "Air, Air and truck" mean? Why is "truck" listed in 3 rows?	Washington County	10/15/09	Agree in part. With respect to "discrepancy" between Table 1.3 and 1.5, note that Table 1.3 clearly states that the figures relate to Oregon shipments. Table 1.5 clearly states that it includes the Portland-Vancouver region. Second sentence on page 16 of draft RTP states, "Due to the inclusion of Vancouver, Washington in the [Table 1.5] analyses, the regional and state-level data are not directly comparable." However, agree there is need to clarify why "truck" is included in several mode categories. Recommend adding the following sentence on p. 14, as noted, after the sentence beginning "With regard to both weight and value, trucks are moving the bulk of Oregon shipments today and into the future. As reported on the federal websites, trucks are included as the highway modal link for air cargo, and for shipments combining rail and trucks, in addition to shipments that are truck-only."

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
27	Existing conditions	Table 1.4 is confusing, The labels are confusing, for example what does "Air, Air and truck" mean? Why is "truck" listed in 3 rows?	Washington County	10/15/09	Agree there is need to clarify why "truck" is included in several mode categories. Recommend adding the following sentence on p. 14, as noted, after the sentence beginning "With regard to both weight and value, trucks are moving the bulk of Oregon shipments today and into the future. <u>As reported on the federal websites, in addition to truck-only shipments, trucks are included as the highway modal link for air cargo, and for shipments combining rail and trucks.</u> "
28	Existing conditions	Data on pass-through traffic hasn't been presented, yet the text on p. 17 states that it's a "significant trend"	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as follows, add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph on page 17 of Draft RTP: "For example, though 90 percent of total regional truck trips begin and/or end within our region, as much as <u>52 percent of the total truck traffic entering the region via the interstate system is through traffic, according to 4,159 roadside intercept surveys (Portland Freight Data Collection Phase II, Final Summary Report, March 2007) This data is consistent with interstate truck shipments as a share of all Oregon-originating truck shipments in the Commodity Flow Survey database (Table 21, Freight in America, 2006.)"</u>
29	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, Page 19 Last sentence of first paragraph says that congestion affects rail traffic.... is this roadway congestion or rail congestion? If roadway congestion, where and how is vehicle congestion affecting the trains? If other congestion, please clarify.	Washington County	10/15/09	Agree. Change last two sentences as follows: "Vehicle Congestion during peak hours adversely impacts these truck movements. Intermittent rail congestion also impacts the <u>from movements required as Class 1 and shortline railroads that provide connections to access the</u> marine ports adds to both local freight and passenger congestion in the port intermodal areas."
30	Existing conditions	Chapter 1, Page 19 The "Industrial sanctuaries" term indicates a specific type of industrial land, the text might be referring to all types of industrial lands rather than a limited set of sanctuaries but it is not clear.	Washington County	10/15/09	Recommend revising the first sentence under "Industrial land supply" on page 19 as follows: " <u>In the context of support for preserving and expanding, as appropriate, all industrial land in the region, industrial sanctuaries should continue to be considered a unique and protected land use.</u> "

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
31	Existing conditions	Figure 1.5 text on page 16 says "450 million tons" but figure adds up to 296.3 million tons, where are the other 153.7 million tons? If Oregon statewide Water shipments weigh 12.3 million tons (table 1.3), how can the Portland Metro area Barge + Ocean commodities weigh 43.5 million tons (figure 1.5)?	Washington County	10/15/09	Agreed there is need for clarification and some technical corrections. Commodity flow databases are notoriously difficult to understand, and they vary in their composition, data sources, methodology, geographic and modal comprehensiveness and reporting/forecasting periods. The first sentence of the second paragraph on DRAFT RTP page 16 is incorrect: the 450 million tons of commodities should have been 435 million tons, and that number was for the entire state of Oregon, not the Portland-Vancouver area. However, even with those corrections, the 1997 data is not useful in this context, and confuses matters. Recommend deleting the entire sentence as follows: " The 1997 Commodity Flow Forecast for the Portland-Vancouver region estimated that 450 million tons of commodities passed through the region over roads, rails, pipelines reference to data from the Freight in America report, which was national in scope, and not focused on the Portland-metro region. "
32	Existing Conditions	Expand Chapter 1 of the draft RTP to include a discussion of energy uncertainty, "peak oil" and price instability as part of the security discussion.	Washington County Commissioner Dick Scouten	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
33	Finance	RTP process should more fully analyze maintenance and operations needs to ensure the region's decision-makers have a complete picture when making investment decisions. This information will allow the region to place much greater emphasis on maintaining our assets and living within fiscal means.	BTA, Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09, 10/15/09	Amend Chapter 3 to expand maintenance and operations discussion with the recognition that the region does not have a comprehensive inventory of maintenance needs in order to fully address the intent of this comment. Metro tried to compile this data as part of the federal component of the RTP update with limited success. To do a more in depth analysis, more data is needed from cities and counties throughout the region; many of which are limited in their ability to provide the data needed. Metro will continue to work with local governments to improve data collection and monitoring for operations, maintenance and preservation needs to better account for this in future plan updates.
34	Finance	Expand funding sources discussion to more clearly show the sources of funding assumed for each coordinating committee target	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
35	Finance	Raising all system development charges to a regional average may not be legal.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	No change recommended. The funding strategies and revenue assumptions were intended to be the equivalent of what is described in the RTP and reflected a desire to have more equity in local revenue raising strategies throughout the region.
36	Finance	Page 20 in Chapter 3, 4th bullet - should text be 2 percent (not 0.02 percent).	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	No change recommended. This is accurate.
37	Finance	Please update the RTP Revenue Targets, Table 3.3 to reflect the Small Starts revenue assumed for streetcar projects as part of the State RTP investment priorities.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
38	Finance	Chapter 3 - Expand financial analysis in Chapter 3 to analyze the shortfall between the financially constrained revenue assumptions and the state RTP financial targets. The analysis should discuss providers' existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund planned transportation facilities and services documented in the RTP. The chapter should not just show the Federal and State RTP Investment Strategy by mode, investment track, but also by category of provider (e.g. ODOT, Trimet, and each of the three Counties and Cities within the Counties).	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
39	Finance	Add bicycle license and registration fees as part of the funding discussion so users pay more.	Terry Parker	10/15/09	No change recommended. Most bicyclists are also drivers, and thus pay auto-related fees and taxes. Bicycling registration is likely to be costly to administer in comparison to the revenue generated, and has the potential to discourage bicycling. Past efforts to require bicycle registration and the experience of other communities have - demonstrated that the net proceeds, after deducting the administrative costs, of bicycle registration programs are minimal. Discussions of these proposals during prior legislative sessions have demonstrated that bicycle registration is not a viable method for funding transportation facilities. Most other states and communities with registration programs have discontinued them for this reason. Bicycling provides a clean, healthy and sustainable alternative mode of transportation. The costs of providing facilities to accommodate and encourage bicycling are minimal in comparison to the value derived by reducing the impacts of our present reliance on motor vehicles for transportation.
40	Finance	Increase transit fares to address transit funding needs so users pay more.	Terry Parker	10/15/09	No change recommended. The draft RTP includes assumptions about increases in fares and the payroll tax and identifies the need to find additional sources of revenue to pay for needed transit investments. Transit is provided with public subsidy because there are many direct and non-direct benefits to society beyond transit riders, including less air pollution, improved efficiency of the existing transportation system, and public health benefits to users who walk or bike to transit.
41	Finance	"Today the federal government is investing less in infrastructure than ever before" (Chap. 3, p. 1) - Do we have data to back this up? What infrastructure? Investing proportionally less in transportation? Since what date? 1990? 1960? 1920?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend to provide citation for this statement.
42	Finance	Chapter 3 page 7- Figure 3.2 is useful and interesting. We believe it would also be useful and interesting to show how Tri-Met taxes and fees stack up against other Metro areas.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended at this time. Comparing transit district revenues is much more difficult because of the variety of different funding sources involved. Not all transit agencies have a payroll tax for example. Figure 3.2 compares just gas taxes and vehicle registration fees that are more common fees amongst all states.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
43	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 9, What is the difference between "transportation SDC levied on new development", and "Traffic Impact Fees on commercial properties", and "developer contributions"?	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The definition for all three terms will be added to clarify what each means.
44	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 9, remove "on assessed properties" for a variety of reasons (redundancy, legal implications, validity of the statement)	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
45	Finance	Property taxes (Chap. 3, p. 9) - MSTIP (as assumed in the financially constrained) is part of General Fund and no longer requires a public vote.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
46	Finance	Chapter 3 page 9 – Development-Based Sources – What are “Traffic impact fees (TIFs) on commercial properties. “? Also, in this section, it would be worth pointing out “in kind improvements by developers” – while these aren’t technically a source of revenue, a significant amount of the system gets constructed based on conditions of development.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend to include a definition for all three terms to clarify what each means. Developer contributions listed on page 9 of Chapter 3 refer to the "in kind improvements by developers."
47	Finance	Page 10 Add Hillsboro to the list of Cities that have adopted street utilities fees.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
48	Finance	Wash. Co. URMD is \$0.25/\$1000 not \$0.50/\$1000 as stated (Chap. 3, p. 10)	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
49	Finance	Figure 3.3 through 3.14 the actual numbers, in addition to the percents provided, would be useful.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Language and tables will be inserted to reflect the total revenue for each category reflected in the Figures 3.3 - 3.14.
50	Finance	Figure 3.3 through 3.14 For all these tables the roads and bridges have been given a different "mode". While the intent of the project may be automobile, these improvements normally contain significant expenditures towards bike-lanes, sidewalks, and even transit improvements. In many cases, the percent costs of the projects that supports alternative modes is often greater than 50%. This results in a significant understatement of the investment in the non-auto modes. Maybe call the category "multi-modal roads and bridges".	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Language will be inserted that clearly defines the types of projects that are associated with each project category.
51	Finance	Chapter 3, Section 3.4 and 3.5 -- Figures 3.4-3.14 --- Clarify in all of these pie charts what distinguishes projects of different types from each other. What causes Throughways to not be in Roads/Bridges? Are some Bike/Ped in Roads/Bridges (e.g., bikelanes) and some not (off-street)? How about Freight? Seems to us that most of this would be in Roads/Bridges in some fashion.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Language will be inserted to clarify the different categories.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
52	Finance	Fig. 3.4-3.8 - If lack of funding is such a critical issue then why don't these charts also look at modal percentages based on cost? It might help reinforce the point that most of the financial need is for motor vehicle related categories	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Figure 3.5 depicts the RTP federal priorities by mode as a percentage share of total cost.
53	Finance	Fig. 3-4, 3-5, 3-7 and 3-8 - These categorizations by mode are somewhat artificial and discount the importance of the motor vehicle mode. For example, Roads/Bridges, Freight, TSMO and to some extent Throughways all relate to the motor vehicle mode. When looked at together, this shows a more dramatic preponderance of motor vehicle needs.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Figures 3.4 - 3.8 are not intended to show needs, but to show the breakdown of investments of the RTP federal priorities by mode. Projects are not directly representative of needs. The summary of needs for each mobility corridor will be included in the mobility corridor strategies as well as the congestion management process.
54	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 16 Numbers in Figure 3.5 do not match the numbers in the paragraph describing it.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The paragraph under Figure 3.5 on page 16 will reflect that road and bridge projects comprise more than fifty percent of all the projects, but just under fifty percent of the total project costs. Transit projects account for 8% of the projects, but 32% of the total cost.
55	Finance	"Road and bridge projects in this category focused on completing new street connections in...No arterial or highway capacity projects were included in this category" (Chap. 3, p. 19). We would bet that many of these street connections were intended to augment capacity on nearby highways and arterials, so why not say that they are also providing road capacity benefits?	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The intent of Figures 3.4 - 3.8 are to show the breakdown of investments by mode of the RTP federal priorities. They are not intended to depict either needs or the benefits of the different types of investments.
56	Finance	Table 3.3 - Washington Co./Cities Modernization Funding Pool was \$3,995.41million not \$4,126.82 million	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
57	Finance	Fig. 3.10 - Show percentages based upon costs as well as number of projects	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Figure 3.11 depicts the State RTP investment priorities by mode as a percentage share of total cost.
58	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 22: "Twenty percent of the projects focus on the bicycle and pedestrian system," We are not sure this is a true statement. In figure 3.0 Bike/ped is 20%, regional train is another 5% plus a significant proportion of the roads and bridges investment will be for bike-lanes and sidewalks. We would assume that regional trail, and Bike/Ped are in fact the same mode.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The language will be changed to reflect that 20% of the projects are focused solely on the bicycle and pedestrian system. The regional trail system is a separate RTP system, different than the RTP bicycle and pedestrian systems.
59	Finance	Fig. 3.15 - Revenue forecasts exceed costs beginning in 2030. What's the significance of this and is it worth mentioning?	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Although the trend line for the revenue forecasts begins to exceed costs in 2030, cumulatively there is still an overall funding shortfall for OM&P from 2008 - 2035.
60	Finance	Fig. 3.16 - Given the lack of data on OM&P from local jurisdictions discussed on page 27 how valid is this chart?	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Federal law requires that the RTP include a discussion of the OM&P for the regional system. The information included is not comprehensive as mentioned on Page 27 of Chapter 3. Figure 3.16 is included as a baseline to reflect what information is currently available. Chapter 3, page 27 calls for a post-RTP task of collecting better information about the asset conditions on regional transportation facilities.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
61	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 30: First paragraph last sentence "State and local government purchasing power has steadily declined." While we do not disagree whatsoever, this statement has not been supported previously in chapter 3. Suggest adding a section that clearly describes how much purchasing power has declined, and how much it is expected to continue to decline by 2035.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested and add citation.
62	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 30: Second paragraph last sentence: as far as we know, all traffic impact fees in the region function as system development charges.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended.
63	Finance	Chapter 3, Page 30: Third paragraph "Diminished available resources". We're not sure the resources are diminished, rather their purchasing power has diminished.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended.
64	Finance	3.6 Moving Forward to Fund our Region's Priorities - This section sings the same old gloom and doom song of not having enough money without fully acknowledging the \$300 million to be raised through HB2001 or the doubling of Wash. Co. TIF fees. While everybody could still use additional funding, these are encouraging signs that should be mentioned.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. HB 2001's funding package raises needed revenue for transportation for the Portland metro region. However, it raises revenue only up to what is already previously assumed in the RTP revenue assumptions out to 2035. By bonding the revenue that is raised it is not providing any additional modernization revenue on top of what is already assumed over the life of the financially constrained RTP. Also, the doubling of the Washington County TIF fee brings the County just above the regional average.
65	Finance	Developing a state RTP investment strategy around a revenue target leaves many needs unaddressed and goes beyond what is required in state requirements for a finance plan.	Washington County Coordinating Committee	10/7/09	This comment will be addressed as part of the mobility corridor strategy documentation work that will be conducted in Winter 2010 in partnership with local, regional and state agencies, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. JPACT directed this approach so the RTP would be more financially responsible and attainable than past plans in recognition of current fiscal realities. The region cannot afford to address all of the needs identified within the plan period of the RTP. The Transportation Planning Rule requires the RTP to define local, regional and state needs, which will be more thoroughly documented in a new chapter of the RTP for each of the region's 24 mobility corridors. While the RTP must identify all needs, it is possible the RTP does not include projects for all identified needs. The documentation will serve as the basis for defining a system of planned transportation facilities, services, and major improvements adequate to meet planned land uses and address documented needs. The strategy will include planning cost estimates when possible to demonstrate the cost of addressing needs to support a discussion of the existing funding mechanisms and the ability of these and possible new mechanisms to fund identified solutions. The strategy may result in changes to system map designations in Chapter 2 of the plan. The project list will represent the region's priorities for implementing the planned system, given fiscal constraints.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
66	Freight Plan	Encourage New Models of Integrated Industrial Land Uses: Today's industrial uses are not the coal-fired, polluting industrial uses of the past. We support finding ways to protect land for industrial uses. At the same time, we must collectively urge regional, local, and private sector decision makers to consider how to integrate mixed land uses, including office, retail and sometimes even housing, into today's industrial areas. TriMet is limited in our ability to provide extensive transit to industrial areas due to the limited uses and low densities of persons per acre, which constrain transit demand and often make fixed-route transit service cost inefficient. A greater mix of uses and higher densities of people could increase TriMet's ability to provide transit service within industrial areas.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change required. Comment noted for future interagency actions.
67	Freight Plan	Buffering Industrial Land Uses: In addition to the changing nature of industrial uses noted above, newer patterns of residential and mixed-use development are emerging. These Transit Oriented Developments are different in kind from the single family residential model and arguably should not require the type of spatial separation from industrial uses suggested in the report. Such higher density residential and commercial development will naturally compete for space along truck routes and adjacent to rail corridors and so we should encourage design guidelines to facilitate this in a positive way, rather than prohibit it.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change required. The Freight Task Force have noted several incidents where land use conflicts have created difficulties. While members may agree that more intense Transit Oriented Development may provide an opportunity to take a new look at design and land use that is suggested by the commenter, in fact, it is just such an intense land use that provides one example of a recent regional conflict over residential/industrial uses.
68	Freight Plan	Pg. 28 "New residential development along truck and rail corridors and adjacent to industrial sanctuary areas should be discouraged" Change to "Appropriate models of residential and commercial development should be planned for truck and rail corridors and areas adjacent to industrial sanctuaries to preserve the effectiveness of truck and rail corridors for industrial and freight use."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
69	Freight Plan	Pg. 33: Section 8.2 Modify the first and fo[u]rth bullets in this list to reflect wording, above.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as follows, replace the second sentence of fourth bullet under section 8.2 with the following: " <u>Appropriate models of residential and commercial development should be planned for truck and rail corridors and areas adjacent to industrial sanctuaries to preserve the effectiveness of truck and rail corridors for industrial and freight use.</u> "
70	Freight Plan	Pg 45 Boxed Table: One point calls forth need to support affordable housing with access to employment and industrial centers. Another point calls for "new strategies to buffer residential and commercial land uses near industrial land and along major truck routes." In light of point one, modify point two compatible with the wording, above.	TriMet	10/15/09	Agree. Replace last bullet under "Design and projects" heading with the following: " <u>Appropriate models of residential and commercial development should be planned for truck and rail corridors and areas adjacent to industrial sanctuaries to preserve the effectiveness of truck and rail corridors for industrial and freight use.</u> "

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
71	Freight Plan	Streetscape Design and Commercial Deliveries: The Last Mile: Street design that facilitates both truck and transit movements is desirable and developing these protocols is an area of potential freight and transit stakeholder cooperation. Point E3 in the Freight Action Plan (Pg. 54-55) calls for providing a freight perspective to revision of the livable street design guide. Amend last sentence of first paragraph to read: "...integrate finer grained land use and transit stop issues into the regional framework."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
72	Freight Plan - Implementation	Sun agrees with continuing the Task Force relating to freight and goods movement. The business community needs to have a voice, as the Freight plan is meant to serve their needs. Good recommendation. The Freight plan includes data collection and reporting - yes! Develop a set of business oriented performance goals and start tracking data.	Pete Lehmann, Sun Microsystems Director of Site Operations, Hillsboro, OR	10/15/09	No change required. Staff will be in contact with Mr. Lehmann to participate in a regional freight and economic development bench, per items A1 and C4 in Chapter 10 of the Freight Plan. Items A3-5 also support the commenter's goals.
73	Freight Plan - Implementation	It is essential that we continue to participate and contribute as part of a larger and ongoing partnership between Metro and the freight and business communities. Now that a direction has been set to invest within the existing regional footprint, we want to work with Metro to guide that investment to the areas, modes and projects where the businesses and communities will see the greatest return. As a first step in that large effort, we ask that Metro staff engage with us to develop a work program from the ideas included in the RFP Chapter 10 action plan elements, such as improvement of our analytic tools to support more rigorous investment and impact analysis, reducing the environmental footprint of freight in our region, development of regional strategies for freight rail and industrial development, and public/private investment guidance to identify infrastructure partnership models that would benefit all.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	10/15/09	No change required. Staff will be developing a database for an expanded partnership between Metro and regional business, freight and economic development stakeholders (see item A 1 on page 48 and C4 on page 53 of the Regional Freight Plan.) Staff will also be calling on those stakeholders, along with agency partners, to help develop a near-term work plan based on other concepts and actions presented in preliminary form in Chapter 10 of the Regional Freight Plan. See especially D1-4, F2, F6, F7,
74	Freight Plan - Policy	Sun Microsystems is \$11.5 B company that manufactures its goods in Oregon for shipping out of state. Specifically, the two problems for Portland's ability to support an exporting company are 1) lack of international flights that support large freight and 2) our location on the west coast, since many large customers are East-coast based. The company can't help the second problem, but can work on the first. Need to keep direct international flights from Portland International Airport. (Portland is one of only 12 US cities with this connectivity.)	Pete Lehmann, Sun Microsystems Director of Site Operations, Hillsboro, OR	10/15/09	No change needed. The region intends to implement the Regional Freight Plan in such a way as to retain companies like Sun Microsystems.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
75	Freight Plan - Policy	Sun Microsystems and Regional Freight Plan goals are in alignment--fund and sustain investment in our multimodal system and create first-rate networks. Result will be reduced delay, better travel time reliability and lower costs.	Pete Lehmann, Sun Microsystems Director of Site Operations, Hillsboro, OR	10/15/09	No change required.
76	Freight Plan - Policy	Sun Microsystems supports focus areas of Freight Plan--reducing core bottlenecks	Pete Lehmann, Sun Microsystems Director of Site Operations, Hillsboro, OR	10/15/09	No change required.
77	Freight Plan - Policy	Regional Freight Task Force recommends exploring what a "sustainable economy" means, and note implications for freight investments as identified in the Regional Freight Plan. To buck the trend of manufacturing and industrial decline, we need regional investments that will support a durable recovery that creates goods jobs, as part of an overall framework that lays out a more balanced approach to global and regional economic growth.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	10/15/09	No change required. Staff will be developing a work plan based on recommended action items in Chapter 10 of the Regional Freight Plan
78	Freight Plan - Policy	The Task Force supports the recently introduced concept of Mobility Corridor Strategy planning if it helps integrate freight considerations early, and in a comprehensive manner. This will help avoid costly fixes later. And because the Task Force carefully evaluated what, why, where and when the freight problems occur (noting, for example, that they do not always coincide with the commute peaks), it recommends that appropriate and required planning efforts proceed to enable good projects to advance to implementation as quickly as possible. Because there are such limited resources for roadway improvements, and because freight movement is and will continue to be dependent on roads for two-thirds of that volume, freight needs must be a primary consideration in selecting the next corridor for refinement planning.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	10/15/09	No change required. Staff is working with regional partners to prioritize the remaining five corridor refinement plans, and begin the plans early 2010.
79	Freight Plan - Policy	Demand Management is Critical to Goods Movement: The majority of freight is moved by truck, requiring good road facilities and reliable traffic flows. With this in mind, we support and encourage managing the demand for these truck intensive facilities, through various demand management strategies, including aggressive incentive and regulatory programs to encourage people to drive less.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change needed. Support for employee commute reduction programs is a policy of the freightplan.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
80	Freight Plan - Projects	Goal F is the most critical to successfully supporting companies shipping product - strategic investment in transportation. The areas of focus that appeared most beneficial were the addressing the core throughway system bottlenecks: I-5, I-5/I-405 loop, US26 and I-5 South to Wilsonville. For Sun Microsystems, shipping international freight through PDX would be a huge advantage. Ultimately, Metro should to steer more of the budget to transportation. The region needs jobs to sustain a high quality of life, and jobs won't survive without transportation infrastructure. Capital projects will need funding to make a noticeable difference.	Pete Lehmann, Sun Microsystems Director of Site Operations, Hillsboro, OR	10/15/09	No change required. Implementation of the Regional Freight Plan anticipates making a strong case for projects that help the freight and business communities, and that maintain and grow good jobs.
81	Freight Plan - Projects	Attachment 1 to Regional Freight Task Force comment letter (10/15/09) provided list of key regional freight priorities, and notes that some are not on the financially constrained draft 2035 (state) RTP project list. The list also notes recommendations for rail projects that would be financed privately or via funding outside of RTP sources, and request adding those projects to the financially constrained list in order to facilitate eventual funding and construction by demonstrating regional consensus.	Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force	10/15/09	No action required on non-rail projects. Recommend adding identified rail projects to financially constrained RTP project list.
82	Freight Plan - Technical Correction	Revise fourth bullet on page 41 as follows: "improving arterial connections to current and emerging industrial areas. Examples include Sunrise Corridor phased improvements recommended by the Sunrise Project Policy Committee and last mile local industry connectors,..."	Clackamas County	10/9/09	Amend as requested.
83	Freight Plan - Technical Correction	Revise first full bullet at top of page 56 as follows: "improving arterial connections to current and emerging industrial areas. Examples include Sunrise Corridor phased improvements recommended by the Sunrise Project Policy Committee and last mile local industry connectors,..."	Clackamas County	10/9/09	Amend as requested.
84	Freight Plan - Technical Correction	Is the reference to "Sunset Corridor" on page 22 of the Freight Plan intentional? Or was "Sunrise" intended?	Clackamas County	10/9/09	No change required. Sunset Corridor was intended in this case.
85	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 1. Jobs. In 2008, 14,80 - this seems to be a typo.	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Correct number in text box to read <u>14,800</u> .
86	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 5. . impacts- How about "environmental and other impacts"	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Amend as requested. Replace last bullet on page 5 as follows: " <u>environmental and other impacts</u> -- managing adverse..."

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
87	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 6. Top. Please look at the type set for Portland "Metro".	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Amend as requested. Correct typeface for the word "metro" in first sentence on page 6.
88	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 6. Footnote 3. "Population forecasts of 58% ..." Does this mean that the population in 2005 was 2,070,000 and shouldn't this number be stated?	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Amend as requested. Replace footnote 3 on page 6 as follows: " <u>Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (September 2009, Table 1.6: Forecasted Population Growth by County) shows a population increase for the four-county metro area from 1,961,104 in 2005 to 3,097,402 in 2035--a 58% increase. Counties include Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington and Clark County in Washington State.</u> "
89	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 10. Second line from the top: " Another to 8 to 10..." Too many to. Should read " Another 8 to 10..."	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Amend as requested. Correct second sentence on page 10 as follows: "Another to 8 to 10 million..."
90	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Page 10. Go down to the second arrow. " The 2002 commodity flow survey projects on overall doubling of freight tonnage moved in the region by 2030." Please see Page 23. 5.1 Highway. Second sentence. "West coast truck traffic is expected to increase 200 percent by 2035." See footnote 8. I am confused by the apparent conflicts in dates due to quoting different documents.	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	No change recommended. Commodity flow data includes all modes (truck, rail, air, marine) while the truck traffic obviously refers only to truck volumes. Additionally, the doubling of overall freight volumes over 20-25 years is an estimate that does vary somewhat depending on the source and the date of the study.
91	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan Page 10. Last sentence. " The region is forecast to have an additional 1.13 million residents..." See Page 6. First sentence. "With nearly 1.2 million..." Which number is correct for 2035?	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	The precise number for forecasted population growth is and additional 1.13 million residents. Given that this is an estimate, staff could have said "more than 1.1 million" or "nearly 1.2 million" on page 6 staff chose the latter, given that 1.13 is 94.2% of 1.2 million.
92	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 22. 4.2 Port activities. Third sentence. " Another to 8 to 10..." Too many to. Should read " Another 8 to 10..."	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Agreed. Correct second sentence on page 22 as follows: "Another to 8 to 10 million..."
93	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Freight Plan: Page 23. 5.1 Highway. Second sentence. Already mentioned on Page 10 correction above.	John Drew, Far West Fibers (Freight Task Force)	10/5/09	Comment noted, but no change recommended. Commodity flow data includes all modes (truck, rail, air, marine) while the truck traffic obviously refers only to truck volumes. Additionally, the doubling of overall freight volumes over 20-25 years is an estimate that does vary somewhat depending on the source and the date of the study.
94	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Page 23-remove the word "origin" at the end of the third sentence under 5.1 Highway.	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
95	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	page 15 - change title at top of text box as follows: " <u>Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force Membership: Engaging stakeholders to develop a regional freight plan</u> "	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
96	Freight Plan- Technical Correction	Add heading to Table of Contents: include corrected heading on page 15 - change title at top of text box as follows: "Engaging stakeholders to develop a regional freight plan" as a Table of Contents	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
97	Functional plan	The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and/or Chapter 5 if the RTP should include provisions for how each of these concepts, polices, and functional system maps apply to and are to be implemented in local TSPs and land use plans, in refinement plans, and in project development.	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended at this time. This will be determined through follow-on functional plan amendments to be developed in Winter/Spring 2010. All of this work will be conducted in partnership with local, regional and state agencies, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010.
98	HCT plan	· P. 78, Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Consider adding some of the following to improve the section. Using the most recent data from the National Transit Database (2007): · o TriMet MAX emits less carbon: 0.213 pounds CO2 per passenger mile compared to national average of 0.41. This is better than many high ridership heavy rail systems such as DC Metro (0.336)	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
99	HCT plan	Page 8 - look at cost of median auto trip if average includes car purchase price.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested to more clearly describe trip costs.
100	HCT plan	Page 28 - Assess corridor against system expansion targets - what does the definition add or mean?	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	This is intended to describe how corridors will be rated using the System Expansion Policy. The corridor assessment will be an evaluation of the corridor.
101	HCT plan	Figure 3.11 - include similar data if available for Portland to Miwaukie LRT and Vancouver LRT.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested. Milwaukie LRT and Vancouver LRT data will be added
102	HCT plan	Page 40 - Clarify whether Figure 3.7 includes operation cost only.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
103	HCT plan	Page 41 - Label X axis to clarify whether it is SOV miles, miles driven or vehicle miles.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
104	HCT plan	Page 44 - Figure 3.11 - include similar data if available for Portland to Miwaukie LRT and Vancouver LRT.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
105	HCT plan	Page 52 - Add clarification of whether this effect is driven by scarcity of parking and income.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
106	HCT plan	Page 70-72 - Add more clarification in the mobility and acquisition sections to describe the significance of this.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
107	HCT - RTP	Chapter 2, page 46: It is unclear from the text in Chapter 2 what the actual System Expansion Policy is, and how it relates to the planned transit facility or service" for purposes of the RTP. Is the SEP primarily a tool for the region to prioritize which corridor(s) will be the next one to advance to Alternatives Analysis, i.e. project development, or is it a tool for local jurisdictions to influence the reassessment of where a specific HCT corridor falls in the four priority tiers during the next RTP update, or both? There is uncertainty about the relationship, if any, between corridor refinement plan prioritization and HCT corridor prioritization under the SEP.	ODOT	10/15/09	The system expansion policy framework is designed to provide a transparent process agreed to by Metro and local jurisdictions to advance high capacity transit projects through the tiers. The framework is based on a set of targets designed to measure corridor readiness to support a high capacity transit project. The system expansion policy framework: 1. Identifies which near-term regional priority corridor(s) should move into the federal project development process toward implementation; and 2. Delineates a process by which potential HCT corridors can move closer to implementation, advancing from one tier to the next through a set of coordinated Metro and local jurisdiction actions. Based on the tiered category, regional actions would be aligned with work in each corridor while local actions would focus on meeting HCT system expansion targets. In near-term corridors, formal corridor working groups would be established. Other corridors would coordinate work through existing processes.
108	HCT plan	· "High Capacity Transit System Development" section has a broad range of information that reads like an unsorted collection of information and ideas. Unless this is simply meant as a technical appendix, it requires more explanation and stronger organization. Is this a catch-all set of information? Is it simply answering questions that happened to come up during public outreach? Organizing themes, headings, or other communication aids would help.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended.
109	HCT plan	P. 59-60, Figures 4.4 and 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, colors for walk area and bike area are reversed.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
110	HCT plan	· Values in Figure 3.9 (density required for each transit mode) need additional scrutiny and in some cases (especially frequent bus) are too low. Text or a note should be added that these should not be taken as rules or requirements, but as an illustration of the impact greater density has on demand for transit (and therefore the appropriate mode and capacity to meet the demand).	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
111	Implementation	Metro should ensure that all local governments adopt project plans that reflect new RTP policy goals.	BTA	10/15/09	The Regional Transportation Functional Plan will direct how local transportation system plans must respond to the RTP. Amendments to the functional plan will be developed prior to final adoption of the RTP in 2010.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
112	Implementation	"This RTP is moving away from a single measure of success..." (Chap. 5, p. 1) - When did the RTP ever rely upon a single measure of success? The existing RTP has pages and pages of goals and objectives. This statement is an exaggeration.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change is recommended. The primary performance measure for the RTP has been v/c based. The 2000 plan did include the modal targets for the centers. However, the primary performance measure for the RTP was still centered on v/c, and past local plans have relied on that measure to define needs and solutions. The 2035 RTP provides an outcomes-based framework with a larger set of performance targets to measure our success at meeting the goals and objectives laid out in the plan.
113	Implementation	Chapter 5: Page 3, fourth paragraph refers to an "investment matrix" twice. This is first time the term is used in the plan (not in the finance chapter whatsoever). This term is confusing and unclear as to the meaning or where the matrix can be found.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The Investment Matrix was created by Metro as result of the Local Aspirations work the has been underway over the last year. The Matrix has been shared with the RTP Work Group, TPAC, MTAC, MPAC, JPACT and Metro Council on a few different occasions as part of preparing the pieces of the Making the Greatest Place recommendations. It is available on Metro's website under the COO MGP recommendation.
114	Implementation	"The goal of the CMP is to develop a systematic approach...through the use of demand reduction and operational management strategies" (Chap. 5, p. 17) - According to US DOT, a CMP is not limited to demand and operational management strategies, and can include capacity expansion.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The second paragraph on page 17 already reflects this.
115	Implementation	Chapter 5, page 9, blue box: if the language is being updated then further review of pages 9-16 is premature.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The language of Chapter 5, pages 9-16 was excerpted from the 2004 RTP and included as a starting point for the discussion of the corridor refinement plans that will take place this fall.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
116	Implementation	Chapter 5, page 16 – The second paragraph states that “Once corridors have established mode, function, general location, and identified potential solutions (typically through the corridor refinement plan) project development is needed to clearly define a set of projects”. This sentence is extremely troubling. First off, “mode, function, and general location” apply to projects in mobility corridors. We certainly can organize projects by mobility corridor and seek to define whether a project is “needed” within the context of a mobility corridor, but once the project is in the plan, it is read to move into project development. The TPR is very clear (OAR 660-012-0050) that during project development, projects authorized in an acknowledged TSP shall not be subject to further justification with regard to their need, mode, function or general location. Project development addresses how a transportation facility or improvement authorized in a TSP is designed and constructed. It seems like the draft RTP may be proposing a new requirement for developing phasing plans for projects in a mobility corridor and using the TPR’s “project development” as the rationale. We recommend that the draft RTP completely eliminate any reference to a Metro role or process for locally funded projects where need, mode, function and general location have already been identified. We may have misinterpreted the intent of the words “...the region must also determine what planning activities are required in the mobility corridors where refinement plans have already been completed...” For locally funded projects in Washington County, we believe no planning activities, beyond traditional project development, are needed.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend this section to remove redundant language. No additional project development process was intended. The intent of this section was to more clearly distinguish between refinement planning activities and project development activities as defined in the transportation planning rule. The intent of the section is adequately covered by the remaining language with this change.
117	Implementation	Chapter 5, page 17, second to last paragraph, last sentence, strike: “Where more motor vehicle capacity is appropriate” and “and get the most value from the investment”	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as follows, “Where more motor vehicle capacity is appropriate, the CMP will include <u>additional system and demand management strategies to ensure the capacity investment is effectively managed</u> supplemental strategies to reduce travel demand to get the most value from the investment.
118	Implementation	Section 5.6.1, first paragraph, first sentence: change “chapter 3” to “section 2.2”	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
119	Implementation	Chapter 5, page 18, second to last paragraph, change “chapter 5” to “chapter 3” and change “chapter 6” to “appendix 1”	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
120	Implementation	Section 5.6.3, page 19, change all “benchmarks shall” to “benchmarks may”	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend to state “benchmarks will...”

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
121	Implementation	"This draft plan does not address several issues,..." The word "several" implies only a few issues remain unaddressed by the plan, however, there are many issues that remain unaddressed (Chap. 5, p. 20).	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
122	Mobility corridors	Previous RTPs and the City of Milwaukie TSP call for additional planning for Mobility Corridors #10 and #11. The City is concerned that not including those corridors as future refinement plan corridors will leave the onus on local governments to reconcile potential conflicts between planned land uses and ODOT's declared function for OR 224.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	No change recommended. The need, mode, function and general location of solutions have been adequately determined through the City's TSP and RTP. The next step is to document that through the mobility corridor strategy. All 24 mobility corridors will have a corridor strategy included as part of the final RTP. The mobility corridor strategies will outline the next steps for near-term, medium term and long term investments and can include recommendations for addressing the issues raised in the comment through future project development activities (See Page 16 of Chapter 5). The mobility corridor strategy will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the RTP.
123	Mobility corridors	In section 5.3, the mobility corridor strategy is introduced. The text should be more clear about how and when the region will consider HCT corridors that are not mapped on the existing mobility corridors, such as 99E between Milwaukie and Oregon City.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	This comment will be addressed as part of the mobility corridor strategy documentation work that will be conducted in Winter 2010. Chapter 2 of the draft RTP includes a map of potential HCT corridors to be evaluated in the future. The system expansion policy provides guidance on what triggers should be in place to move a corridor forward to more detailed analysis and evaluation.
124	Mobility corridors	Too much process for corridor refinement plans as described in Section 5.4.	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The MOU or IGA from a corridor refinement plan is intended to provide more accountability and to formalize agreements across implementing jurisdictions on moving forward to implement the corridor refinement plan recommendations. This is particularly important in corridors with multiple jurisdictions.
125	Mobility corridors	Add a description of the Sunrise Phasing Plan to the Appendix 3, Sunrise Preferred Alternative. Include a brief description of the policy direction for selecting the projects, the short term and long term project lists and the triggers for constructing the next projects.	Clackamas County	10/15/09	Amend draft RTP to document the findings and recommendations from the Sunrise Preferred Alternative, including the phasing plan, as part of documenting the mobility corridor strategy for this part of the region.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
126	Mobility corridors	Document a mobility corridor investment strategy and planned system for each of the 24 mobility corridors identified in the RTP. This documentation should identify needs and the system of planned facilities for each corridor based on the RTP "system completeness concept" as defined by the Regional System Concepts and Policies of Chapter 2 - including a description of the type or functional classification of planned facilities and services, their planned capacities and/or levels of service (for all modes), the general location or corridor, facility parameters such as minimum and maximum ROW width and number and size of lanes, and identification of the provider; and performance standards including proposed alternative mobility standards for OTC consideration. For refinement plan mobility corridors, the RTP must identify needs and may defer specific determination of mode, function and solutions or improvements to the refinement plan process for that corridor.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. A new chapter of the RTP will be created to include this information. The documentation will include needs, planned facilities and solutions from previously adopted corridor refinement plans such as the OR 217 Study, Powell/Foster Corridor Study and the US 26 Corridor Plan. The documentation will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010.
127	Mobility corridors	Revise Chapter 5, page 10, second bullet; to call the interchange "N. Wilsonville" interchange to avoid confusion with Stafford Road Interchange on I-205.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
128	Mobility corridors	The RTP should recognize emergency service locations throughout the region and include strategies to prevent congestion around them. In 2008, three Providence hospitals responded to nearly 189,000 emergency room visits and more than 80 percent of these patients came to the hospital by private vehicle. These locations are vulnerable to traffic congestion and delays. Providen supports a balanced approach to addressing congestion, including encouraging employees to travel to work by walking, bicycling, and transit.	Providence Health and Services	10/14/09	Amend Chapter 1 of the RTP to include a map of emergency service locations (hospitals, emergency rooms and immediate care locations) in the region and consider access needs of these locations as part of the mobility corridor strategy documentation work to be conducted in Winter 2010.
129	Mobility corridors	Chapter 5, page 4/5: Figure 5.1 shows mobility corridor #2 being from Central City to Tualatin. Table 5.1 shows mobility corridor #2 as "Portland Central City to Tigard"	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested to reflect that MC #2 should be from Portland Central City to Tigard. The Mobility Atlas lists the title of the MC as to Tualatin, but all of the corresponding analysis is to Tigard, which is a <u>logical functional segment</u>
130	Mobility corridors	Fig. 5-1 Mobility Corridors in the Portland Metropolitan Region - In our view, this schematic is not very informative because it gives no indication as to which roads are contained within the corridors. Furthermore, the reference to Portland metropolitan region in the figure title is misleading because some of the corridors (e.g., Forest Grove to North Plains) are outside the Portland metropolitan area.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
131	Mobility corridors	Chapter 5, pages 6 and 7 - We are concerned about the notion of entering in MOU's or IGA's for projects that are identified in the RTP that are ready for Project Development. We see absolutely no value in this task, especially for projects that require no federal funding. If a mobility corridor does not need a corridor refinement plan, then all of the projects in the corridor should be "good to go" and can proceed into project development at the discretion of the facility owner/operator.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The specifics behind the mobility corridor strategies and how they relate to both corridor refinements, the HCT system expansion policy, and state, regional and local levels in advance of project development will be further developed by the RTP Work Group, TPAC, MTAC, MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council in Winter 2010 and prior to the adoption of the RTP by ordinance in 2010. It is not implied that mobility corridors not needing refinement plans would be precluded from beginning project development. The MOU or IGA from a corridor refinement plan is intended to provide more accountability and to formalize agreements across implementing jurisdictions on moving forward to implement the corridor refinement plan recommendations. This is particularly important in corridors with multiple jurisdictions.
132	Mobility corridors	Figure 5.2 is very confusing. It does not show the steps to complete the mobility corridor strategy. It seems to show how project development might proceed, but not a complete project development framework.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The specifics behind the mobility corridor strategies and how they relate to both corridor refinements, the HCT system expansion policy, and state, regional and local levels in advance of project development will be further developed by the RTP Work Group, TPAC, MTAC, MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council in Winter 2010 and prior to the adoption of the RTP by ordinance in 2010. It is not implied that mobility corridors not needing refinement plans would be precluded from beginning project development.
133	Mobility corridors	Chapter 5: Needs a section to describe the generalized steps each mobility corridor strategy development process would take.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended.F193
134	Mobility corridors	Table 5.2 show the status of each mobility corridor - which step the corridor is at in the development of the mobility corridor strategy (some corridors might be complete)	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The specifics behind the mobility corridor strategies and how they relate to both corridor refinements, the HCT system expansion policy, and state, regional and local levels in advance of project development will be further explored by the RTP Work Group, TPAC, MTAC, MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council in Winter 2010 and prior to the adoption of the RTP by ordinance in 2010.
135	Mobility corridors	Table 5.2 - Corridor #20 Tigard to Sherwood seems to be missing from this list	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Mobility Corridor #20 was added by TPAC to the Portland Central City to Wilsonville mobility corridor in need of a refinement plan after the Draft RTP went to print. Table 5.2 will updated to reflect this change.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
136	Mobility corridors	Chapter 5: What is the status of the corridors not recommended for future refinement plans?	Washington County	10/15/09	All 24 mobility corridors will have a corridor strategy included as part of a new chapter in the final RTP. The mobility corridor strategies will outline the next steps for near-term, medium term and long term investments. The mobility corridor strategy will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The needs and potential solutions will be documented in that effort.
137	Mobility corridors	5.4.1 Documentation of mobility corridor strategy in RTP - This seems to heap a bunch of new regional prerequisites that could hamper local jurisdiction's abilities to make improvements on their regional roads. The details of this need to be discussed further before we buy into anything. How does it affect roads that have already been funded but have not yet begun project development?	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. The mobility corridor strategy and updated refinement plan descriptions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The needs and potential solutions will be documented in that effort as part of a new chapter in the final RTP. Solutions with funding would be able to move forward into project development. This is not intended to be a "regional prerequisite," it is intended to document the region's strategy for addressing needs in each of these corridors and to show how agencies have prioritized investments within each corridor in a more comprehensive and integrated manner.
138	Mobility standards	Chapter 5, page 22, final paragraph: again add to improve State Highway performance as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation of State Highway performance" after "... all feasible actions".	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended. This section will go away upon completion of this unresolved issue, prior to final adoption of the RTP in June 2010.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
139	Mobility standards	Amend the RTP and Regional Transportation Functional Plan to include actions regional and local jurisdictions will take in TSPs and land use plans to meet requirements of the TPR and Oregon Highway Plan Actions 1F3 and 1F5. This work needs to be completed prior to Oregon Transportation Commission consideration of alternative mobility standards for the Metro region. Metro must demonstrate that taken together, the RTP and regional and local implementing actions are "doing the best they can" to improve State Highway performance as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation of State Highway performance". That includes TSPs addressing gaps and deficiencies (= needs) identified in the Mobility Corridor Strategies for which no solution or improvement has yet been identified in the Federal or State project lists, such as vehicle, bike, ped, and transit improvements to parallel arterials and completion of the local and arterial circulation system for short trips, in order to maintain Throughway mobility for long-distance and freight trips. That may also include local adoption of transit- and pedestrian-supportive land use designations, prohibition of auto-dependent land uses, as well as more aggressive parking management in 2040 Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets, and Station Communities if the new alternative mobility standards are proposed to be lower inside those 2040 Concept Areas than on the rest of the State Highway system.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The actions will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. Actions to be considered include all of the elements included in the comment.
140	Mobility standards	Chapter 2, Need to clarify the applicability of the "Interim Regional Mobility Policy". Does it apply only to State Highways? To the Regional Arterial and Throughway Network? The third paragraph in the blue text box should be amended to clarify that "The RTP and RTFP must include all feasible actions to improve State Highway performance as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation of State Highway performance.	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended at this time. This will be determined through the alternative mobility standards work called out in Discussion item #3 in Winter 2010. As applied in the current RTP, the policy applied to the Throughway and Arterial network. Changes to the text will be identified as part of that effort.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
141	Mobility standards	Chapter 2, page 15 - 16 and Table 2.4: Areas of Special Concern should be deleted from this RTP. Specific alternative mobility standards and actions to improve and/or avoid further degradation of State Highway performance should be established as part of the applicable Mobility Corridor Strategy or as part of the applicable Mobility Corridor Refinement Plan. Appendix 2 does not in fact include adopted performance measures, as stated in the text of Table 2.4 and in Figures 2.2 through 2.6. The OHP Table 7 does include an adopted standard of V/C 1.0 for the first peak hour in Beaverton Regional Center, and V/C .95 on Highway 99W from I-5 to Tualatin Road, but not for the other Areas of Special Concern. Since the previous RTP was adopted, a corridor refinement plan has been conducted for the I-5 to 99W corridor area including Tualatin Town Center, and a Corridor Improvement and Management Plan has been completed for the Highway 99W area in Tigard, which are not reflected in Figures 2.5 and 2.6 and Appendix 2.	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended at this time. This will be determined through the alternative mobility standards work called out in Discussion item #3 and documentation of each mobility corridor strategy in Winter 2010. All of this work will be conducted in partnership with local, regional and state agencies, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. Changes to the areas of special concern designations will be identified as part of that effort.
142	MTIP	Ensure funding allocation for freight in future regional flexible funds allocation processes, consistent with other modes. Implement an economic impact analysis for project evaluation. Allocate future MTIP flexible funds based on an economic filter, considering return on investment and require accounting of project performance from recipients for all funding allocations using metrics such as project cost, implementation deadlines and actual demonstrated benefit.	Port of Portland, Portland Business Alliance	10/15/09	These comments have been forwarded to the MTIP policy update that occurs prior to the next Regional Flexible Fund allocation process for consideration. The RTP covers all investments in the regional transportation system - local, regional and state. Regional flexible funds are only a small portion of the funds programmed in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) or of total transportation investments made in the region. Currently the RTP does not provide specific direction for how regional flexible funds are to be allocated to projects. Metro is considering how an RTP policy framework could more specifically direct the MTIP process and the investment policies of the various funding programs, including regional flexible funds, that are consolidated and programmed in the MTIP. Traditionally these comments would be appropriate for consideration during the MTIP policy update that occurs prior to the next Regional Flexible Fund allocation process. Comments on the MTIP were solicited in the recent MTIP "retrospective" process and would have been an appropriate venue for these comments as well. In past regional flexible fund allocations, categories included eligibility for funding freight projects, however funding for each project category has never been guaranteed. Economic considerations have been broadly evaluated in each cycle, but have only been one of several criterion used for evaluating and selecting projects. Performance targets are proposed for adoption in the draft RTP and therefore will be considered as part of the MTIP policy update during the 2012-15 MTIP process.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
143	Performance	The region should completely cease using roadway mobility standards. Level of congestion is a poor measure (and negative performance target) compared to other proactive performance targets recommended in the draft plan. These standards are not attainable. A new measure or index needs to be developed to measure the total and relative performance of the system.	BTA	10/15/09	This comment will be addressed through the alternative mobility standards work that will be conducted in Winter 2010. See Discussion item #3.
144	Performance	Preliminary modeling results show the RTP No Build scenario performs better than the RTP federal priorities and RTP Investment strategy for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. As a result, the draft plan does not adequately address or respond to climate change. This should be addressed prior to moving forward.	BTA, City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. See Discussion item #1. The 2009 Legislature required Metro to "develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios" designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles by January 2012 through HB 2001 (Sections 37 and 38). It also requires Metro to adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment. Finally, local governments are required to adopt comprehensive plan and land use regulations consistent with the adopted scenario. Transportation infrastructure, transportation pricing, technology and land use are part of the solutions recommended by the draft RTP. The effect of more aggressive application of each these strategies will be tested as part of the HB 2001 land use and transportation scenarios in 2010.
145	Performance	More discussion is needed on why the "build" scenarios show minor system-level changes when compared to the "no-build" scenario and how to reconcile RTP projects.	City of Beaverton, City of Portland	10/15/09, 10/15/09	Amend Chapter 4 of the RTP to include more subarea and district-level of analysis of the results - where more dramatic differences can be identified.
146	Performance	Better explain dramatic reduction in air pollutants.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
147	Performance measures	Chapter 4: How Far do we Go Toward Achieving our Vision - Does this mean "how far have we gone toward achieving our vision" or "how far should we go toward achieving our vision"?	Washington County	38639	No change recommended at this time. Chapter 4 lays out performance measures and system analysis findings to show the extent to which the RTP investment strategy moves measures in a direction that is consistent with the region's vision and goals for its transportation system.
148	Performance measures	Chapter 4, p. 4: Recommend evaluating VHD on the entire system, not just the freight system.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended at this time. The work group developing the RTP performance measures evaluated the broad application of vehicle hours of delay and determined that its specific application to the freight network provided the best measure progress in meeting RTP Goal 2 - Sustain Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity. However, vehicle hours of delay is a standard output of Metro's travel forecast model and is available to jurisdictions for analysis. The RTP performance target also includes a measure of motor vehicle hours of delay per traveler.
149	Performance measures	Chapter 4, Table 4.2: Recommend adding VHD. Consider removing either VMT or average trip length, as these are reporting similar information.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend table 4.2 to add a measure for hours of congestion. Metro will work with its regional partners to develop this measure.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
150	Performance measures	Chapter 4, Table 4.2. Recommend adding a description of how these will be measured to the chapter.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend section 4.2.2 to describe the process for developing the performance monitoring measures.
151	Performance measures	Chapter 4, Table 4.2: Add percent of motor vehicle lane miles completed.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended.
152	Performance measures	Chapter 4: 2. Total delay and cost of delay on the regional freight network - Add note to table describing delay and cost assumptions used to calculate results.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend section 4.3.2 to include assumptions.
153	Performance measures	Chapter 4: 3. Motor Vehicle and transit travel time between key origin-destinations - The important thing here is the change in travel times, which is not calculated. Add columns of change in minutes and % change and reorder O-D pairs to show greatest % change pairs first.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
154	Performance measures	Chapter 4, p. 9: Central City to Vancouver should not be n/a.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend table to create a single Central City to Vancouver transit travel time measure.
155	Performance measures	Chapter 4, p. 11: Clarify the number being reported. Is this an all day or peak period number? Does it include trips to/within/from the location or some subset of those?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend 4.3.5 to include description of time period and origin/destination. Non-drive alone mode share is calculated as all weekday (AWD). The percentages reported represent an average of from, to and within the geographic area.
156	Performance measures	Chapter 4, p. 13: Number 9 - Tons of transportation related air pollutants drops significantly in all categories; Number 10 – tons of greenhouse gas goes up significantly. Add an explanation.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend section 4.3 to include a summary of findings for each performance measure.
157	Performance targets	Chapter 2, page 16, Interim Regional Modal Targets: these non-drive alone modal targets were approved by LCDC as an alternative to the TPR's VMT per capita reduction targets. Any change in these modal targets would have to be approved by LCDC.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend to remove the word "interim" from Table 2.5 and section heading. These targets will continue to serve as an alternative to the TPR's VMT/capita reduction targets. A VMT/capita reduction target is also proposed in Table 2.3.
158	Performance targets	Add performance targets for mobility and reliability to Table 2.3 in Chapter 2.	ODOT	10/15/09	No change recommended. A system reliability target is recommended to be developed as part of the Regional mobility program prior to the next RTP update. The targets for safety, congestion, active transportation, travel and access to daily needs are intended to serve as a proxy for integrated mobility in the region. Other mobility and reliability measures are recommended in Chapter 4 for system analysis and monitoring between plan updates.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
159	Performance targets	The RTP performance targets should be adopted formally by the region with robust monitoring and feedback loops to inform future RTP, TSP and land use efforts.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change needed. See Discussion item #2.
160	Performance targets	Chapter 2 points out that more work is needed to refine performance targets (page 13), Interim regional mobility policy (pages 14-15) and interim regional modal targets (page 16). More description is needed of what this work will entail.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. This is described in Section 5.7 of the draft RTP and in Discussion items 1-3 of the comment log.
161	Performance targets	The RTP performance targets seem optimistic and ungrounded. If Metro and local governments are to be held to the targets, we should understand them to be aggressive but achievable - not as challenges with no sense of whether the region can meet them.	Washington County	10/15/09	See Discussion items 1 and 2. The targets are not arbitrary, and have been drawn from federal and state legislation as described in Discussion items 1 and 2 of the comment log. JPACT endorsed the targets on the basis that it is important to improve accountability of investment decisions and to provide a policy mechanism to ensure that investment priorities are helping the region make progress toward the desired outcomes and goals of the plan. The region will evaluate what it will take to achieve the targets as part of the climate change scenarios work that will follow the RTP update. Refinements to the targets could be identified at that time.
162	Policy	Define employment and industrial lands shown on Figure 2.20	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	No change recommended. These are 2040 land use designations as defined in the 2040 Growth Concept.
163	Policy	More clearly distinguish between bicycle parkways and other plan elements.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
164	Policy	Add new policy that states "promote walking as the mode of choice for short trips." to section 2.5.6	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
165	Policy	Page 66, paragraph 2, replace "marked street crossings" with "enhanced street crossings" to recognize more than marking streets is needed to make crossings safer.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
166	Policy	Section 2.5.6 - blue box, replace "an" with "a" in policy	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
167	Policy	Include the six outcomes, goals, objectives, targets, policies and system evaluation measures (Chapter 4) in one place (in document or appendix) and develop a graphic that shows their	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
168	Policy	Clarify whether the policy areas are in fact policies, as implied and revise accordingly.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested. These are policies.
169	Policy	Add more description of what Figure 2.16 is describing.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
170	Policy	More clearly define what the system expansion policy is and next steps for using it.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
171	Policy	Take into account low-income households as part of future planning for transportation in East Multnomah County	Human Solutions - the Mid and East Multnomah County Community Development Corporation	10/15/09	No change needed. The RTP includes policies and performance targets that direct future planning and investment decisions to take into account low-income and minority households to ensure the benefits and burdens are equitably distributed throughout the region. Targets have also been recommended to reduce the number/share of households spending more the 50 percent of their income on housing and transportation combined.
172	Policy	Taking the MAX with my bike downtown from the west side is difficult due to the train crowding. There is not sufficient room for many bikes.	Jeff Hollister	9/11/09	No change recommended. TriMet has recognized this issue and has developed a bicycle facilities plan. Due to constraints in increasing the capacity for bikes on buses/trains, TriMet is focused mainly on increasing bicycle parking at transit stations. TriMet, with input from regional stakeholders, has developed Bicycle Parking Guidelines. The guidelines consider station context and regional travel patterns and will help TriMet and local jurisdictions determine the appropriate location, size and design of large-scale bike-parking facilities, including Bike-Transit Facilities designated in the RTP (Figure 2.22). Between the downtown Portland and the Westside there are Bike-Transit facilities currently proposed for PGE Park MAX, Goose Hollow MAX, Sunset TC, Beaverton TC, Beaverton Creek MAX, Orenco MAX, Tigard TC, Tualatin WES, Barbur TC. This comment has been forwarded to TriMet for consideration.
173	Policy	Implement congestion pricing on the entire urban highway network and reinvest revenue raised in maintenance and expansion of the highway system.	John Charles	10/15/09	No change recommended pending completion of the Metro area congestion pricing pilot project study and climate change scenarios that were directed by the 2009 Legislature. The RTP includes this strategy, recognizing that additional work is needed to determine where and when this strategy is appropriate. The Pilot Project study represents an opportunity to look at this more comprehensively and with consideration of other outcomes the region is trying to achieve.
174	Policy	Revise Chapter 2, • Page 8, Objective 1.2: parking management as follows, "Minimize the amount and promote the efficient use of land dedicated to vehicle parking".	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
175	Policy	Chapter 2, page 27, Table 2.6: the text under typical number of travel lanes" for the 3 Throughway Design classifications should be amended to add "plus auxiliary lanes," ", similar to the description of the typical number of travel lanes on Arterial Streets as "4 through lanes with turn lanes".	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
176	Policy	Chapter 2, page 32, Throughways: the text should clarify that Principal Arterials are the Vehicular Functional Classification that is implemented through the Throughway Design Classification, and that there are three types of Principal Arterials/Throughways, i.e. Freeways, Highways, and Parkways. These should be defined in the Arterial and Throughway Network by reference to the Throughway Design Classifications and in the Glossary. In addition, the second sentence should be amended to read <u>Throughways are planned to consist of 6 through lanes plus auxiliary lanes, with grade-separated interchanges or intersections</u> ".	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
177	Policy	Chapter 2, page 34, Arterial Streets: similarly, the text should be amended to clarify that there are 3 kinds of Arterial Streets: Major, Minor, and Rural, and that they are implemented through the Street and Boulevard Design Classifications.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
178	Policy	Chapter 2, page 35, first paragraph, second sentence states that (Collector and local streets) are not part of the regional transportation system. This appears to be inconsistent with the definition of the regional system on page 20, which says that transportation facilities within designated 2040 centers, corridors, industrial areas, employment areas, main streets and station communities" are part of the regional system". Reconcile these two statements.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
179	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 13: The goal for active transportation says, "By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit trips compared to 2005." Is the intent to triple the number of trips for each, or to triple the mode share of each? There is a big difference when you consider population growth.	City of Portland	10/13/09	No change recommended at this time. The target calls for tripling the number of walking, biking and transit trips by 2035.
180	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 13: The goal for travel says, "By 2035, reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10 percent compared to 2005." This puts us at 17.5 miles/person/day...down from 18.3 today...not particularly ambitious. In contrast, our climate action plan calls for a 30% reduction in VMT. Also, the performance measures in section 4 at 14.23 miles/capita in 2005, that is much different than the numbers Metro produces each year which have us around 20 miles/capita...what is the difference? Modeled vs. actual?	City of Portland	10/13/09	No change recommended at this time. The target calls for a 10% reduction of vehicle miles traveled within the urban growth boundary. In 2005 VMT per person was 14.23 miles. The target shoots for an average of 12.8 miles traveled per person by 2035. The city of Portland's VMT goal is tied to a smaller, more urbanized area of the region. The 10% target applies to trips that occur within the urban growth boundary and takes into account developing areas.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
181	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 71: Under the four policy areas Goal 4, "Implement incentives and programs to increase awareness of travel options." Add "AND incent behavior change." It needs to be more than awareness of options, people need to use the information and change behavior.	City of Portland	10/13/09	Amend section 2.5.7 to include the Regional TSMO Plan vision, goals and principles, and redefine the four policy areas as investment areas. Amend as requested.
182	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 72: The table with TDM examples needs amendment, the examples provided don't give the reader any feeling that they should invest in TDM. This section should recognize the work that other jurisdictions are doing (TriMet's employer program, Youth bus passes, car-sharing programs, the work TMAs are doing..etc) and have some stronger metrics like the TSM section has. In general the TSMO framework section highlights a lot more TSM than TDM.	City of Portland	10/13/09	Amend as requested.
183	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 72: This section is another example of a place that should highlight the link between building things and encouraging people to use them.	City of Portland	10/13/09	Amend section to highlight role of education and marketing in capital infrastructure investment.
184	Policy	Much of the RTP seems oriented to achieving regional goals through emphasis on non-SOV modes of travel, but there is no statement that explicitly states this. Add a statement along the lines of: "The intent of this plan is to achieve its objectives and goals principally through emphasizing non-automotive modes of personal travel."	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The intent of the RTP is to achieve its goals and objectives through emphasizing a variety of strategies that include walking, biking and use of transit. Other strategies to be emphasized include transportation system management and operations (TSMO) and land use.
185	Policy	Ch.2 p.59 First policy area focuses an interconnected network of bicycle facilities between jurisdictions. Bicycling is primarily local in nature. Inter-jurisdictional travel, while it should be provided for, is going account for only a small proportion of trips because of the distances involved. The principal policy in this regard should be to focus on creating integrated, dense and low-stress bikeways in a 3-mile radius from the Central City, all Town & Regional Centers, and along Main Streets and Corridors.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Agree in part. Amend text to read "Build an interconnected network of bicycle facilities that provides seamless travel between jurisdictions-- access to 2040 target areas"
186	Policy	Amend language in the "Vibrant Communities" desired outcome (Ch.2 p.2) to state the "People live and work in vibrant communities where they can choose to walk and bike for pleasure and to meet their everyday needs."	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The desired outcomes were developed as part of the broader Making the Greatest Place effort and adopted by Resolution No. 08-3940 expressing the intent of Metro and its regional partners to use a performance-based approach to guide policy and investment decisions in the region. The term walk was used not as a mode, but as a way to illustrate the type of place -- walkable. This comment has been forwarded to staff for consideration as part of legislation to be approved in 2010 to implement Making the Greatest Place recommendations.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
187	Policy	Introduction to Ch.2 includes the protection of farm land as an aim of the region's transportation vision. Why isn't it included in the desired outcomes (ch.2 p.2)	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The desired outcomes were developed as part of the broader Making the Greatest Place effort and adopted by Resolution No. 08-3940 expressing the intent of Metro and its regional partners to use a performance-based approach to guide policy and investment decisions in the region. The term walk was used not as a mode, but as a way to illustrate the type of place -- walkable. This comment has been forwarded to staff for consideration as part of legislation to be approved in 2010 to implement Making the Greatest Place recommendations.
188	Policy	Amend Objective 3.2 of Goal 3 to read: "Reduce vehicle auto miles traveled per capita". Bicycles are vehicles too.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as follows, "Reduce average daily auto vehicle miles traveled per capita." This more accurately reflects what is being measured.
189	Policy	Include discussion about the need to emphasize comfort and safety in bikeway design.	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. P.63 of 2.5.5 Regional Bicycle Network Vision includes text: "...attributes such as slower speeds and less noise, exhaust and interaction with vehicles, including trucks and buses, make them more <i>comfortable</i> and appealing to many cyclists." p.64 includes text describing the key experiential aspects that bike parkways embody: "Comfort and safety provided by protection from motorized traffic."
190	Policy	Ch.2, p.63 Amend text to acknowledge that low-volume streets not only complement arterial bike routes, but often supplant them.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as follows: "Low-volume streets often provide access to 2040 Target Areas as well as residential neighborhoods, <u>complementing and sometimes supplanting</u> bicycle facilities located on arterial streets."
191	Policy	Why aren't the Regional Bicycle Parkways on the Regional Bicycle Network map (Fig. 2.22).	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The Regional Bicycle Parkway concept emerged late in the policy development phase of the RTP. As stated in footnote on p.62, Regional Bicycle Parkways are not currently shown on figure 2.22. A future Regional Action Plan following the RTP update is recommended to further develop the bicycle parkway concept, including desired parkway spacing, designation of routes, and prioritization for implementation.
192	Policy	Ch.2 Pg. 66: The pedestrian network section is insufficient compared to other modal sections of the RTP. As a region, walking should be the first mode of transportation people consider and plans, policies, and actions should lead to this. The language of this section should not frame walking primarily as a supporting mode. It is a vital segment of the larger collection of modes.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended. Ch.5 (Unresolved Issues) describes the need for an Active Transportation Action Plan (Section 5.8.9). The development of this plan would provide an opportunity to bolster regional pedestrian policies, which did not receive as much attention as other policies in the 2035 RTP update.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
193	Policy	Ch.2, P. 68: In the improve pedestrian access to transit section, the RTP suggests that transit/mixed use corridors should be designed to promote pedestrian travel with street crossings at least every 530 ft. While this is an acceptable and common minimum, ideal spacing is in the range of 200 to 400 feet, and the shorter within that range the better. The language should clearly indicate a preferred in addition to a minimal acceptable value.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as follows: "...at a minimum of <u>least every 530 ft - though an ideal spacing in the range of 200 to 400 feet is preferred...</u> "
194	Policy	Ch.2, P. 70: (Third paragraph, second sentence). "A complete pedestrian system provides a basic building block for economic vitality in centers and other commercially-oriented areas, but when incomplete fails to maximize the connection between transportation and land use that helps contribute to vibrant communities." Sidewalks should be promoted on all streets except on expressways, not just in centers and other commercially-oriented streets.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as follows: Add sentence at end of 3rd paragraph: <u>"It is important for local jurisdictions to pursue sidewalks on every street (except expressways), even if they are not defined as part of the regional pedestrian network (transit mixed-use corridors, mixed-use centers, station communities and regional trails.)"</u>
195	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 9: Objective 4.4 Demand Management – <i>"implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to increase awareness of travel options,"</i> – should go beyond increasing awareness. It should be to significantly increase walking, biking and taking transit.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend Objective 4.4 to read ... <u>increase awareness and use of travel options.</u>
196	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 71: Under the four policy areas the first policy needs to be more explicit. It should say, "Use advanced technologies, pricing strategies, and other tools to actively manage the demand for the road system and increase walking, biking, and taking transit." Likewise, the fourth policy area should say, "Implement incentives and programs to increase awareness of travel options and decrease driving."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend section 2.5.7 to include the Regional TSMO Plan vision, goals and principles, and redefine the four policy areas as investment areas.
197	Policy	Chapter 2, p. 73: The plan states that parking management strategies aim to use parking resources more efficiently. This is only part of the story. Parking management and pricing are some of the most effective tools for encouraging changes in travel behavior. Metro should investigate a regional-scale parking pricing strategy in the appropriate land use types that aims to change regional travel behavior and reinforces the land uses patterns in the 2040 vision.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend to incorporated RTO subcommittee and TransPort recommendation to add an action to develop a regional parking management strategy.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
198	Policy	Chapter 3 page 2: The two paragraphs in 3.2 note that "the fundamental state requirement for the RTP is to develop a plan that is adequate to serve planned land uses." And goes on to say that "the region must have a financing strategy that supports implementation of the plan." And goes on to say that since the revenues identified to comply with federal requirements do not provide financial capacity to meet the state requirement identified in the Plan, the Region it is necessary to identify "more sources of revenue for the RTP to satisfy state requirements." As we have argued, this means that the State requires a system adequate to serve travel needs. It does not mean we should limit our definition of need due to financial constraint.	Washington County	10/15/09	This comment will be addressed as part of the mobility corridor strategy documentation work that will be conducted in Winter 2010. All 24 mobility corridors will have a corridor strategy included as part of a new chapter in the final RTP. The mobility corridor strategies will outline the next steps for near-term, medium term and long term investments. The mobility corridor strategy will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The needs and potential solutions will be documented in that effort. The RTP is <u>not</u> limiting the definition of need to what the region can afford.
199	Policy	Revise chapter 2 to more clearly describe the relationships between targets, objectives, goals and outcomes.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. This is described in Section 2.1.
200	Policy	Washington County (and other jurisdictions) should allow development to make interim improvements to support walking and bicycling on collectors and arterials that are planned to have full street improvements, but funding is not available or development is not required to bring the facility to urban standards. The current "all or nothing" approach is not sufficient. Planning guidelines should be developed and more funding directed to facilities that are not eligible for MSTIP funding or that will not be addressed through future development projects.	Washington County CPO-1 Connecting Neighborhoods Subcommittee	10/15/09	This comment has been forwarded to cities and counties for consideration as part of future updates to local transportation system plans. Metro will also work with local governments to update the livable streets handbooks after the current RTP update. This is another opportunity to bring more attention to this issue and to develop guidelines for addressing interim solutions that could be implemented to address shorter-term needs. Finally, work will continue in 2010 to identify new sources of revenue to fund existing and future infrastructure needs in the region. Completing gaps in sidewalks and bicycle facilities have repeatedly been identified by the public as important investments to make to improve the safety of the transportation system.
201	Policy	The regional pedestrian network definition (section 2.5.6) should be broadened to include all streets (excluding only limited access highways and potentially some topographically challenged locations). The RTP should at least recognize every arterial street and transit route that is formally a part of the regional system as a pedestrian facility. A more comprehensive map based on the 2001 regional sidewalk inventory should be included as a supplement or replacement for Figure 1.19 in Chapter 1.	Willamette Pedestrian Coalition	10/12/09	No change recommended. Ch.5 (Unresolved Issues) describes the need for an Active Transportation Action Plan (Section 5.8.9). The development of this plan would provide an opportunity to bolster regional pedestrian policies, which did not receive as much attention as other policies in the 2035 RTP update.
202	Project	Support retaining Project #11116 (Garden Home Road) in the federal priorities project list to improve safety, but do not support major road widening or the addition of turn lanes.	Ashcreek Neighborhood Association	10/14/09	No change recommended. These comments have been forwarded to the city of Portland for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP and design work the City of Portland will do as a follow-on to the RTP.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
203	Project	Add Project #10284 (Taylors Ferry Road) to the Federal priorities project list.	Ashcreek Neighborhood Association	10/14/09	No change recommended. The comment has been forwarded to the city of Portland for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP work the City of Portland will do as a follow-on to the RTP.
204	Project	Add SW 45th/SW 48th and SW 62nd/61st/Pomona/64th and Multnomah Boulevard to the RTP.	Ashcreek Neighborhood Association	10/14/09	No change recommended. These comments have been forwarded to the city of Portland for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP work the City of Portland will do as a follow-on to the RTP.
205	Project	RTP process should provide much more rigorous screening criteria by which projects must pass to be included in the RTP project list.	BTA, Coalition for a Livable Future, Stephan Lashbrook	10/15/09	This comment will be considered as part of developing the work program and process to be conducted for the next update to the RTP.
206	Project	Adoption of the Beaverton TSP did not occur in time to allow projects to be forwarded to the RTP. Clarify how the city's new TSP and final RTP will fit together during the interim period when the new TSP projects will be different from the RTP projects.	City of Beaverton	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
207	Project	Amend project description (11049) to read: "Pleasant View Dr., Powell Loop to Highland Dr." Amend Project End Location from Binford Parkway to "Highland Dr". This would extend the project limits very slightly to the south.	City of Gresham	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
208	Project	Metro RTP Project #11103, which includes all corridor refinement plans, as well as other Metro sponsored regional program line items such as TOD, RTO, Regional ITS/TSMO, Regional Trail Planning, and Active Transportation were inadvertently omitted from the public comment project list.	City of Gresham, Metro staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
209	Project	Add #10844 (Construct Cornelius Pass Road as 5 lane facility from TV Highway to Rosa Road) into RTP for \$45 million.	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested if this fits within the JPACT revenue target.
210	Project	Add #10814 (Widen Evergreen Parkway from 25th to Sewell to five lanes) into the RTP for \$4 million	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested if this fits within the JPACT revenue target.
211	Project	Update #10819 (Construct 3 lane Century Boulevard from Baseline to Cornell) into the RTP for \$6.8 million	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
212	Project	Add #10575 (Construct West union Road as five-lane arterial from Cornelius Pass Road to 185th) to the RTP for \$26.2 million	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested if this fits within the JPACT revenue target.
213	Project	Update #11285 to widen Farmington Road to five lanes	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
214	Project	Text on page 15 in Chapter 3 does not acknowledge regional investments directly support bike and pedestrian travel.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested. In addition, this section will be significantly updated to better describe all modal elements and the breakdown of the project list by additional categories, such as reconstruction to urban standards, boulevard retrofits, widening, street connectivity, etc..

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
215	Project	Reconcile discrepancies between Figure 3.4, 3.7 and 3.8 for regional trails.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
216	Project	Park-and-ride lots should be classified as mobility investments.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
217	Project	For project #10164, please change the project costs into 2007 dollars in the amount of \$41.478 million. Also, please update the overall City of Portland total revenue table to reflect this change.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
218	Project	For project #10176, please change the project costs into 2007 dollars in the amount of \$121.335 million. Also, please update the overall City of Portland total revenue table to reflect this change.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
219	Project	Chapter 3, page 1 - changing the name of the lists is confusing.	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The name of the project lists will be refined as the RTP is finalized in 2010 to more clearly communicate the intent of the
220	Project	Figure 3.1 - it is unclear how this figure relates to the project list.	City of Portland	10/15/09	No change recommended. The project lists have been broken up into these two categories for purposes of analysis. The categories are intended to reflect the complementary role of community building investments and mobility investments as defined in the policy chapter and this section of the plan.
221	Project	Add Project #10747 (OR 217 overcrossing - Cascade Plaza) to the Federal priorities and state RTP project lists.	City of Tigard	10/15/09	Amend as requested. This project was inadvertently left off the project list despite being part of the Washington County submittal on behalf of the cities of Washington County. This project fits within the JPACT endorsed revenue targets.
222	Project	Additional information on how each of the projects support the RTP goals should be required. Information submitted by jurisdictions is inadequate to truly assess the projects. Jurisdictions should be provided sufficient time and tools to assess how their project lists reflect the new RTP framework.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	Agree in part. Metro required more detailed information as part of the project solicitation process conducted in 2007 as part of the federal component of the RTP update. This had mixed success for a variety of reasons. The RTP timeline required us to further simplify the project solicitation process further for this component of the process. Metro will work with the jurisdictions to improve project descriptions and expand the Chapter 3 investment strategy analysis in Winter 2010. In addition, the project list will be updated to include information on whether projects are located on regional freight routes and designated Goal 5 resources. Local TSP work that will follow the RTP will more comprehensively reflect the new RTP framework. Future RTP updates will also require more thorough project descriptions to address these concerns, and allow more time for project list updates.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
223	Project	Evaluate the projects based on the RTP goals, using evaluations to prioritize funding as was done to evaluate the Regional Flexible Fund projects in the MTIP.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	No change recommended. It is not possible to conduct a project level evaluation for the more than 1,000 projects included in the RTP within the staff resources allocated for RTP updates. However, future RTP updates will consider other geographies (such as subarea or county level) to assess how well the system of projects performs and meets the goals of the RTP. Staff will work on a project assessment methodology that could be considered. The evaluation process will be developed in partnership with cities, counties, ODOT, SMART and TriMet - with policy direction from JPACT, MPAC and the Metro Council.
224	Project	Metro should analyze how proposed transportation investments will impact land use in the UGB and proposed urban and rural reserves.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	Amend as requested. A MetroScope analysis will be conducted as part of finalizing the Urban Growth Report in 2010. Findings from this analysis will be documented in Chapter 4 of the final RTP. This issue will be further addressed as part of the climate change scenarios work and future RTP updates.
225	Project	Public comment opportunity should be provided on the system analysis and time provided to jurisdictions to revise their project lists to address issues that arise.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	No change recommended. A final public comment opportunity will be provided in Spring 2010 prior to final adoption of the RTP. This will include the results of the system analysis. Local TSPs and the climate change scenarios work will be directed to address any issues that arise through the final analysis. The local TSP updates and climate change scenarios work will likely result in amendments to the RTP as part of the next update.
226	Project	Washington County and Hillsboro submitted three 7-lane arterial projects (#10596, #10835, #10846) and grade-separation of arterials (#11045, #10552, #10556 and #10557), inconsistent with the system development concepts in the plan which call for 4-lane arterials with turn pockets at Together, these projects total \$100 million.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	Amend project descriptions for these projects to direct local TSPs and the Tualatin Valley Highway Corridor refinement plan to re-evaluate the need for these projects based on the final RTP and provide sufficient documentation that all other solutions have been exhausted in these corridors, including system management and operations strategies, increased transit service, changes to land use, etc. consistent with the congestion management process. The projects were identified to meet current mobility standards that may be revised as part of the alternative mobility standards work that will be conducted in Winter 2010.
227	Project	Several arterial widenings are located near the edge of the urban growth boundary and may have unintended consequences for urban and rural reserves being considered at this time.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	No change recommended. The projects are all located within the UGB. A preliminary review of these projects noted that the arterial projects were located primarily near areas proposed to be urban reserves and some proposed undesignated areas. Projects reviewed include: #10026, #10029, #10047, #10078, #11342, #10157, #10430, #10396, #10550, #10555, #10560, #10564, #10565, #10574, #10596, #10597, #10602, #10820 and #10836. A more thorough review of these projects will be conducted in coordination with the reserves designations process. Policy issues will be raised for consideration at that time.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
228	Project	The US 26 tunnel entering downtown Portland and branching off to I-405 both north and south has traffic issues that need to be addressed - frequent lane changes causes safety concerns, causes backups all the way to OR 217. This area needs a long term solution plan which will be very costly (redesigning the tunnel into separate tunnels eventually with more lanes. This critical route is being ignored; short term, less costly experiments should be implemented to improve the flow.	Jeff Hollister	9/11/09	No change recommended. As part of the 2035 RTP, the Regional Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan recommends ways to better manage the existing transportation system. This plan proposes investing in freeway management in the I-405 Loop and US 26 tunnel to improve traveler information and better address safety concerns. The RTP proposed corridor refinement plans for both the I-405 Loop and I-5 south corridors that would look at potential long range improvements to the US 26 tunnel.
229	Project	Expand frequent transit service throughout the region.	Jim Howell	10/15/09	No change recommended. Transit service is proposed to be expanded throughout the region where potential ridership and land use aspirations support increased levels of service within the financial capabilities of TriMet and SMART. This comment has been forwarded to transit agencies to further consider when developing Transit Investment Plans.
230	Project	Eliminate Columbia River Crossing project from the RTP.	Jim Howell, David Osborn	10/15/2009, 10/15/09	No change recommended. This comment has been forwarded to the CRC project sponsor's council for consideration.
231	Project	Halt all planned expansion of rail transit in the region because it diverts resources away from road-related modes of travel - cars, trucks, emergency vehicles, pedestrians, buses and bicyclists.	John Charles	10/15/09	No change recommended. Most funding for transit comes from sources that cannot be spent on road-related projects. Expansion of high capacity transit is part of the region's strategy to provide a balanced transportation system that also expands choices for travel and leverages planned economic development and growth in 2040 centers. This form of transit will also help the region address reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
232	Project	Transportation equity depends on not just mobility - ability to move around, but also access - one's ability to be mobile. Expanding roads and highways in the Metro region is not the way to improve our transportation system. The projects must also allocate funding a space for those without cars or who choose to not use them. The current road emphasis of the RTP projects will not make us more mobile, address climate change, or make this the "greatest place."	Katelyn Hale	10/15/09	This comment has been forwarded to ODOT, cities and counties for consideration as part of developing project list refinements in the current RTP update and for consideration as part of future updates to local transportation system plans. See also Discussion item #1.
233	Project	Support for Saltzman Rd. extension.	Matt Wellner	9/21/09	No change recommended.
234	Project	For project #10164, please add the following language to the project description, "Extend Moody/Bond couplet to SW Hamilton St. Realign SW Hood to connect to SW Macadam/SW Hamilton intersection." This change is based on the North Macadam Transportation Development Strategy released in April 2009 by the City of Portland.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
235	Project	For project #10165, please change the project description to the following, "Convert SW Moody to two lanes southbound only. Extend SW Bond Ave. from SW Gibbs St. to SW River Parkway as two lanes northbound only." This change is based on the North Macadam Transportation Development Strategy released in April 2009 by the City of Portland.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
236	Project	For project #10165, please change the project name to, "Moody/Bond Ave. Couplet - SW Bond Extension (River Parkway to Gibbs)" This change is based on the North Macadam Transportation Development Strategy released in April 2009 by the City of Portland.	City of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
237	Project	Delete #10574 (Farmington Road) for \$17.3 million as this is a duplicate of #11285	Metro staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested
238	Project	Support for #11116 (Garden Home improvements)	Michael Kisor	10/15/09	No change needed.
239	Project	Reduce the scope of the Columbia River Crossing project; travel demand projects will not be as high as forecasted due to fuel costs and availability. Focus instead on replacing the railroad bridge and seismic retrofits.	Nellie Korn,	10/15/09	No change recommended. This comment has been forwarded to the CRC project sponsor's council for consideration.
240	Project	Add a statement to RTP that all improvements on ODOT facilities are subject to ODOT approval and must be consistent with ODOT standards (including mobility, design, access, signal warrants, traffic manual standards).	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested, with an added clarification as follows, " <u>Local governments may request design exceptions from ODOT on a case-by-case basis.</u> "
241	Project	Include Project 10139 (I-205 Climbing lanes) in the Mobility Corridor Strategy to be developed	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
242	Project	Project 11286 (OR 43 Terwilliger/Tryon Creek Bridge) ODOT recently improved the culvert here, it is unclear whether the bridge still needs to be replaced.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
243	Project	Project #10127 (OR 43 Improvements) - update description to reflect city-adopted conceptual design plan	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
244	Project	Project 11284 (Farmington Road) - update to list as an ODOT facility and reconcile with project #10574 which appears redundant.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
245	Project	Reconcile the following overlapping or redundant projects: #10219 (Argyle on the Hill) and #10874 (Deltal Park Phase 2), #10141 (I-205/OR 213 interchange Phase 1) and #11180 (OR 213/Washington St); #10155 (Wilsonville Road/I-5 ramps) and #11071; #10734 (I-205SB to I-5 SB) duplicates #10872; and #10600 (US 26/Shute Road Interchange) and #11178 (US 26/Shute)	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
246	Project	Remove ODOT as co-nominator on the following projects: #10248 (S. Waterfront), #10286 (Ped. Overpass), #10316 (Halsey Bridge), and #10335 (42nd Avenue Bridge).	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
247	Project	Remove ODOT as co-nominator and list ODOT as facility owner on the following projects: #10259 (Powell Multi-Modal improvements), #10228 (82nd/Columbia), #10173 (Macadam ITS), #10175 (Yeon ITS), #10182 (St. Johns Ped District), #10235 (South Portland), #10255 (Macadam/Curry intersection), #10282 (Barbur/Capitol/Huber/Taylor's Ferry), #10283 (Barbur Multi-Modal), #10285 (Barbur Multi-Modal), #10291 (82nd Avenue), #10309 (Macadam Multi-modal) and #10332 (Lombard ITS).	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
248	Project	Remove ODOT as owner/operator from the following projects: #10114 (Sunrise parkway), #10852 (95th/Boones Ferry), #10383 (I-84/Us 26 connections), #10160 (Lloyd district access), #10163 (I-5/Gibbs), #11342 (I-5/99W southern arterial interface)	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
249	Project	List ODOT as the facility owner/operator on the following projects: #10545 (OR 10/Oleson), #10018 (82nd Avenue), #10138 (OR 212), #11172 (OR 43 Bike connection), #10098 (OR 99E), #11198 (Portland-Milwaukie Active transportation Project), #10245 (Steel Bridge), #10287 (West Portland) with City, #10299 (Lombard), #11324 (Barbur Bridges), #11826 (82nd/Columbia) with city, #10803 (TV Highway Signal), #10780 (OR 47 intersection), #11136 (TV Highway/209th), #11137 (TV Highway/Century) with City, #11279 (US 26/185th) with county, #11220 (Hall), #11223 (Hall/Hunziker/Scoffins) with City, #10723 (OR 99W), #10732 (Boones Ferry), #10743 (OR 99W), and #10595 (Hall).	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
250	Project	Update cost estimates for the following projects to be more accurate with ODOT's most recent estimates: #10014 (82nd) should be \$13.6 million, #11242 (I-205/10th St.), #10545 (OR 10/Oleson) should be \$40 million)	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
251	Project	Revise project description for Project # 10343– West Hayden Island Crossing as follows, "Provide primary access to Port's Marine Development and secondary access to existing development of Hayden Island, <u>if it is determined through the West Hayden Island planning process that development of this portion of the island is an appropriate location for a bridge.</u> "	Portland Bureau of Transportation	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
252	Project	Save taxpayer money - don't replace the I-5 bridges; build a third bridge downstream near the BNSF railroad bridge to connect SW Washington to Washington County.	Ron Swaren	10/13/09	No change recommended. This comment has been forwarded to the CRC project sponsor's council for consideration.
253	Project	More transit is needed between Clackamas County and Washington County via I-205. There is no transit connection between the Green Line at Clackamas town center station and the WES commuter rail station. Many thousands of commuters drive from homes in Clackamas County to jobs in Washington County.	Stephan Lashbrook	10/15/09	No change recommended. TriMet has submitted a project (11332) that will build (in-lane) BRT along I-205 from Clackamas to Tualatin.
254	Project	Change the action under the heading Park&Ride Traveler Information (page 21 of draft plan) to read "Add Park&Ride feature to a future TriMet multi-modal trip planning tool. The project will focus on Park&Ride lots that are at capacity in order to direct users to the next best Park&Ride. The tool might be based on estimates or real-time parking space availability (e.g., models and/or sensors) depending on project needs and investment decisions."	TransPort and RTO Subcommittee	10/8/09	Amend as requested.
255	Project	Add a new action under transportation demand management that says "Parking management – This action serves as a placeholder for developing a larger-scale parking management action aimed at reducing peak-period congestion while promoting access to areas served by non-auto transportation options (transit, bike, walk and rideshare). The action will include public education, resources for enforcement of existing parking management strategies and increasing technology for variable pricing at existing parking meters, and opportunities for suburban jurisdictions to advance parking management strategies. The action must begin to take into account possible negative effects such as business impacts, spillover into adjacent neighborhoods and socio-economic impacts."	TransPort and RTO Subcommittee	10/8/09	Amend as requested.
256	Project	Add a statement to Arterial Corridor Management project description for each mobility corridor that addresses the addition or upgrade of traffic signage.	TransPort and RTO Subcommittee	10/8/09	Amend as requested.
257	Project	"Project lists were created using the six desired outcomes for a successful region and the JPACT-endorsed draft performance targets" (Chap. 3, p. 14). In our case, project selection was more based upon local needs, priorities and funding targets rather than outcomes, refinement criteria and performance targets.	Washington County	10/15/09	No change recommended. Local jurisdictions used the six desired outcomes for a successful region and the JPACT-endorsed draft performance targets as a framework for bringing forward projects. The idea was that the prioritization of local needs based on the funding targets would use the outcomes and targets to guide decision-making.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
258	Project	Chapter 3, Page 15 "Less than twenty percent of the projects focus on the bicycle and pedestrian system." We are not sure this is a true statement. In figure 3.4, Bike/Ped is 18%, Regional Trail is another 7%, plus a significant proportion of the roads and bridges investment will be for bike-lanes and sidewalks. We would assume that regional trail, and Bike/Ped are in fact the same mode.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. The language will be changed to reflect that 18% of the projects are focused solely on the bicycle and pedestrian system. The regional trail system is a separate RTP system, different than the RTP bicycle and pedestrian systems.
259	Project	Project #10555 has been completed. Delete from the project list.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
260	Project	For project #10569 no cost is shown. Insert a project cost of \$17,611,000.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
261	Project	Project #10579 has the incorrect project limits (119th Ave. doesn't exist). Replace 119th with 117th.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
262	Project	Project #10598 has the incorrect time period. Change it to 2008-2017.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
263	Project	For project #10610 the Regional Center land use is incorrect. Replace it with Town Center.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
264	Project	For project #10613, 119th Ave. doesn't exist, so replace it with 117th.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
265	Project	For project #11093 no cost is shown, but project is already funded with \$650,000 in ARRA funds. Reflect this in the project cost.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
266	Project	For project #11233 no cost is shown. Insert a project cost for \$13,576,000.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
267	Project	For project #11234 no cost is shown. Insert a project cost for \$19,096,000.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
268	Project	For project #11235 no cost is shown. Insert a project cost for \$25,673,000.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
269	Project	Project #10575 should reflect West Union to Cornelius Pass Improvements, Cornelius Pass to 185th, Arterial, Provide congestion relief, Widen from 2 to 5 lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks, \$26,192,000, 2026-2035, Neighborhood not shown. Insert project as described with no federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
270	Project	Project #10594 should reflect Greenburg Rd. Improvements, Gomartin Ln. to Washington Square Dr., Arterial, Provide congestion relief, Widen to five lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks, \$15,547,000, 2026-2035, Regional Center. Insert project as described with no federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
271	Project	For project #10598, 2018-2025 time period is incorrect. Replace with 2008-2017.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
272	Project	Project #10687 should reflect Sherwood, Sherwood, South Loop Rd., 99W to 99W, Local, Provide congestion relief, Construction of 2 lane frontage road, \$3,410,000, 2018-2025, Employment area not shown. Insert project as described with no federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
273	Project	Project #10697 should reflect Sherwood, Sherwood, 2040 Corridor Pedestrian Improvements, Completes gap in pedestrian system, Sherwood Blvd., Edy Rd., Oregon St. pedestrian upgrades, \$3,026,000, 2018-2025, 2040 corridor. Insert project as described with no federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
274	Project	No cost was provided by Tualatin or shown on sheet for project #10734. Please obtain and show a project cost.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
275	Project	Project #10728 has a cost of \$78,000 and is less than \$1 million minimum put forth for projects as part of the RTP. Should this be bundled with other projects to reach a minimum threshold?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
276	Project	Project #10711 has a cost of \$307,000 and is less than \$1 million minimum put forth for projects as part of the RTP. Should this be bundled with other projects to reach a minimum threshold?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
277	Project	Project #10777 is the same as #10795. Delete project.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
278	Project	Project #10780 was submitted with \$8,300,000 in Financially Constrained funds and another \$3,000,000 in State RTP funds. If total \$11,600,000 cannot be accommodated under Federal Priority cap then shown remaining \$3 million under State RTP cap.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
279	Project	Project #10783 was submitted under Financially Constrained cap and project list should reflect it as a federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
280	Project	Project #10802 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Could it be bundled with Project #10803?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
281	Project	Project #10803 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Could it be bundled with Project #10802?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
282	Project	Project #10804 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Could it be bundled with another project?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
283	Project	Project #10807 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Could it be bundled with Project #10808?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
284	Project	Project #10808 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Could it be bundled with Project #10807?	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
285	Project	Project #11245 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. It needs to be bundled with a similar project and shown as a federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
286	Project	Project #11246 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Bundle Projects #11246-#11250 together as pedestrian infill and show as federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
287	Project	Project #11247 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Bundle Projects #11246-#11250 together as pedestrian infill and show as federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
288	Project	Project #11248 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Bundle Projects #11246-#11250 together as pedestrian infill and show as federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
289	Project	Project #11249 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Bundle Projects #11246-#11250 together as pedestrian infill and show as federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
290	Project	Project #11250 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. Bundle Projects #11246-#11250 together as pedestrian infill and show as federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
291	Project	Project #11251 has a cost below \$1 million minimum. It needs to be bundled with a similar project and shown as a federal priority.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Metro staff will work with Washington County staff to bundle projects.
292	Project	For project #10812, 2008-2010 time period not consistent with instructions. Replace with 2008-2017.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
293	Project	For project #10813, 2009-2014 time period not consistent with instructions. Replace with 2008-2017.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
294	Project	For project #11134, 2011-2013 time period not consistent with instructions. Replace with 2008-2017.	Washington County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
295	Project	Add a six-lane OR 217 project to the state RTP strategy for \$600 million and corresponding revenue assumptions to cover this new project. This is a planned project that came from the OR 217 corridor study and past RTPs and current local plans have assumed this project to be planned for the purposes of future land use decisions. The project is consistent with throughway concept in draft RTP.	Washington County Coordinating Committee	10/7/09	No change to RTP project list recommended. This comment will be addressed as part of the mobility corridor strategy documentation work that will be conducted in Winter 2010. All 24 mobility corridors will have a corridor strategy included as part of a new chapter in the final RTP. The mobility corridor strategies will define needs and outline the next steps for near-term, medium term and long term investments. The mobility corridor strategy will be developed in partnership with local, regional and state agencies in Winter 2010, prior to final adoption of the plan in June 2010. The potential solutions and costs will be documented in that effort - including the planned system recommended by the OR 217 corridor study.
296	Project	Add the following projects to the Federal Priority List: 10283 Barbur Blvd, SW (3rd - Terwilliger): Multi-modal Improvements - Construct Improvements for transit, bikes and pedestrians. Transit improvements include preferential signals, pullouts, shelters, left turn lanes and sidewalks. 10285 Barbur Blvd, SW (Terwilliger - City Limits): Multi-modal Improvements - Complete boulevard design improvements including sidewalks and street trees, safe pedestrian crossings, enhance transit access and stop locations, traffic signal at Barbur/30th, and bike lanes (Bertha - City Limits). 11324 Barbur Bridges - For seismic upgrades, reconstruction and bike and ped. facilities. - separate this project into two projects so that completing bike and pedestrian gaps south of Naito Parkway can be completed) Split project #10227 (Stephenson/Boones Ferry Road) into two projects so the intersection improvement can be included in the Federal priorities list. Add the following Portland TSP projects into the State RTP: SW Multnomah Boulevard, SW Boones Ferry Road, SW Huber, SW 19th, SW 19th and SW Spring Garden Road.	web survey, Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc, Kay Durtschi	10/15/09	No change recommended. Given limited money, ODOT investment priorities focused on maintaing mobility in the region's freeways and freight routes. ODOT encouraged local governments to bring projects forward for state-owned facilities. The city of Portland submitted an Active Transportation Demonstration Project for SW Barbur Blvd. to Metro for consideration. PBOT decided to wait for the outcome of this process before adding these projects to the Federal Priority list. The projects could be amended to the Federal Priority List is this grant is funded. The Barbur Bridges project (#11324) is a new project for the State list. All of the Barbur Projects were a priority for the SWNI and were included in the State list of RTP projects. The I-5/SW Barbur Blvd./OR 99W corridor is recommended for future refinement planning to determine the general location of HCT proposed for this corridor as well as a long-term solution to address identified needs for all modes of travel. Additional analysis in this area may indicate additional needs and could modify projects and investment priorities for this corridor. There are a number of projects in SW Portland on the Federal Priority Project List. These include: three projects on Capitol Highway, plus Garden Home Road, city-wide sidewalk infill, and SW sidewalk infill. These comments have been forwarded to the city of Portland and ODOT for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP work the City of Portland will do as a follow-on to the RTP. The transit comments have been forwarded to TriMet for consideration as part of the next Transit Investment Plan update.
297	Project	Add #10845 (Construct Evergreen Parkway as 3 lane facility from Glencoe to Hornecker Road) into RTP for \$12.5 million.	City of Hillsboro	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
298	Project	Project # 10343 - West Hayden Island bridge - This project was recently reaffirmed by the City Portland contingent upon the West Hayden Island planning process. Until that process is completed, it is premature to include in the RTP, displacing many other important projects.	Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	No change recommended. These comments have been forwarded to the city of Portland and Port of Portland for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP work the City of Portland will do as a follow-on to the RTP.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
299	Project	There is a need to reopen discussion of the westside bypass connecting I-5 to US 26 in western Washington County. This will become increasingly important as the urban reserves process moves forward.	Greg Miller, James Sullivan	9/21/09	No change recommended. The 2035 RTP identifies the need for addressing rural arterials that operate outside of the UGB. It is an outstanding issue that will be addressed as the urban and rural reserves process is resolved at the end of 2010.
300	Projects	Supports Sunnybrook extension project (#10019) . This road will help alleviate traffic problems at Sunnyside and Harmony roads. Currently OIT's only access point (Harmony Rd) is crowded and dangerous. The Sunnybrook extension would provide another access point. This project will be a major contributing factor in OIT's decision about its ability to expand class offerings in the east metro region and make future investments at the Harmony Campus location.	City of Happy Valley City Council, Oregon Institute of Technology, Clackamas County Community College	10/1/09, 10/12/2009 and 10/13/09	No change recommended.
301	Projects	Amend the RTP project list with updated cost estimates and project descriptions for multiple projects within Clackamas County.	Clackamas County	10/6/09	Amend as requested.
302	Projects	Add Springwater Trail (Rugg Rd to Boring) to financially constrained project list as it has already received TE funding, but construction has not been obligated.	Clackamas County	10/6/09	Amend as requested.
303	Projects	Add three new Sunrise-related projects to the financially constrained project list: Sunrise Multi-use trail, OR 212/224 and Milwaukie Expressway	Clackamas County	10/6/09	Amend as requested with other project list refinements to keep within the federal priorities funding target for Clackamas County.
304	Projects	It is difficult to bike from the west side into downtown Portland. It would be great if long term we had a bike route that ran from Sylvan to either Goose Hollow or Portland State area. I clearly would double or triple the amount of times I ride my bike to downtown Portland.	Jeff Hollister	9/11/09	No change recommended. This connection is part of the long-term regional vision for the bicycle system. The Regional Bicycle Network map (Fig 2.22) shows a future regional trail paralleling US 26 which would connect Sylvan to Goose Hollow. No RTP project has been identified to build this connection. The City of Portland has included this connection in their Bicycle Master Plan as a future "Major City Bikeway," but has not yet identified a construction project. This comment has been forwarded to the City of Portland for consideration.
305	Projects	Add Trolley Trail (already funded project) to RTP Financially Constrained list, since its final phase of construction has not yet been obligated. Document in our financial accounting that we're carrying forward old \$ (\$4.5 million).	Metro Staff	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
306	Projects	Amend the financially constrained RTP project list to include a list of rail projects and amend the City of Portland/Port of Portland revenue tables to reflect an additional \$71.954 million dollars in Port/private funds.	Port of Portland	9/28/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
307	Projects	Add six identified rail projects to the Fiscally Constrained RTP project list	Port of Portland	10/15/09	Amend as requested. These have been reviewed by the Freight Task Force and were also submitted by the Task Force as recommended changes.
308	Projects	Several comments requesting that Metro remove the Sunnybrook extension project (#10019) from the RTP because of environmental and traffic impacts of the road; 3 creeks natural and rare native old growth White Oak trees (300-500 years old) are in the project area, which provide needed canopy and drainage control.	Steve Berliner, Friends of Kellogg & Mt. Scott Creeks Watershed; Pat Russell, North Clackamas Citizens Association; Catherine Blosser & Terrence Dolan, Susan Shawn, Urban Green, Friends of North Clackamas Parks, North Clackamas Urban Watersheds Council; Dolly Macken-Hambright, Linwood Neighborhood Association, The Grove Homeowner's Association; Richard Till; Dick Shook; Christopher Swain, David Aschenbrenner; Patricia Holloway, Southgate Planning Association; Lynne Gibbons; Greg Ciannella; Lewis Miller; Walker Leiser; Matt Krueger; Jan Esler-Rowe; Michele Eccleston; Daniel Platter; Donald Wiley; Jeremy Person; Alex Bigazzi; Sean Sweeney; Genevieve Layman; Debbie Reynolds; Kathleen Mcfarlane; Matt Krueger, Grey to Green Tree Canopy Program - City of Portland Environmental Services; Chris Runyard; City of Milwaukie	9/15 - 10/15/09	No change recommended. This project is the last of a set of transportation improvements identified over 20 years ago in the Clackamas Regional Center (CRC) Plan. The improvements are designed to support the CRC, an area that the region has planned to be a hub for households, employment and economic growth within unincorporated Clackamas County. The project provides local and regional connectivity, improving circulation and reducing the need to widen existing roads. Providing access to the Harmony Community College Campus from the south reduces traffic congestion in surrounding neighborhoods. Connecting Sunnybrook to Fuller road would improve both east/west and north/south connectivity. The project would improve the bicycle and pedestrian connectivity in all directions. For example the connection to Sunnybrook Boulevard provides a high quality multimodal link from the Harmony campus to the ODOT's I-205 multiuse path, one of the most significant multimodal links to the I-205 Green Line, and areas to the east. Throughout the last decade Clackamas County has invested millions of dollars in transportation improvements to realize the densities outlined within the CRC plan. Though significant development has occurred, significant development opportunities are still to be realized. The project provides congestion relief and safety improvements necessary to support the existing and planned development. Existing safety/congestion issues exist at the intersections of 82nd Avenue with Sunnybrook Boulevard and Sunnyside Boulevard. These existing congestion issues are not only impacting current expansion opportunities at the Harmony Community Campus, but are also hampering development potential within the entire Clackamas Regional Center. Safety issues also exist at the Fuller Road/Harmony Road intersection, which ranks high on the County's pedestrian/vehicle incident list. Throughout the EIS and subsequent processes there were a number of concerns raised regarding environmental impacts of the roadway. Staff has listened to these concerns and took actions to reduce impacts. Some of these actions include realignment, reduced width, and
309	RTP System Maps	Revise map on page 33 of Chapter 2 to show Allen Boulevard west of Hall Boulevard as a minor arterial.	City of Beaverton	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
310	RTP System Maps	Revise Figure 2.15 to designate SE Harrison/SE Main as a major bus stop, not a transit center	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
311	RTP System Maps	Revise Figure 2.15 to Lake Road/21st as a planned LRT station	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
312	RTP System Maps	Amend Figure 2.12 Arterials & Throughways system map text box in East Multnomah County to read: "A proposed I-84/US 26 corridor refinement plan will define the long-term mobility strategy for the <u>East Multnomah County area, including an analysis of 181st/182nd, 223rd/Fairview Parkway, 242nd/Hogan, and 257th/Kane, in accordance with the 2007 MOU.</u> "	East Multnomah County Transportation Committee	10/5/09	Amend as requested.
313	RTP System Maps	Amend Figure 2.12 Arterials & Throughways system map text box arrow in East Multnomah County so that it does not point directly to the 242nd ROW. Add arrows pointing to all four facilities (181st, 223rd, 242, 257th), or just include arrows pointing toward the outer boundaries of study area - 181st and 257th.	East Multnomah County Transportation Committee	10/5/09	Amend as requested.
314	RTP System Maps	Change functional class of 242nd/Hogan Rd from Principal arterial to major arterial to be consistent with other North/South arterials in the area & remove bias from future corridor refinement plan. Include dashed line showing proposed connection to US 26 at southern end of rd should be included on all maps that show the dashed line connection to I-84 at the northern end.	East Multnomah County Transportation Committee and Multnomah County	10/5/09, 10/15/09	Amend as requested.
315	RTP System Maps	Amend transit system map (Fig 2.15) to include Frequent Bus service on Mcloughlin on Mcloughlin (south of Milwaukie) and Barbur (downtown Portland to Sherwood).	Metro Staff	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
316	RTP System Maps	Chapter 2, Figure 2.12, Consolidate rural arterials designated on Figure 2.10 into a single "rural arterial" designation to acknowledge the role of this network in carrying urban to urban trips and moving goods produced in the rural areas to their market.	Metro staff	10/12/09	Amend as requested. In addition, update unresolved issue on this topic to defer a broader policy discussion on rural arterials to follow the urban and rural reserves designation process. Parts of the rural arterial network will be critical providing the base transportation infrastructure for areas that are designated as urban reserves.
317	RTP System Maps	Update throughway and arterial network map (Figure 2.12) as follows, designate state facilities located outside the UGB and that connect to neighboring communities as principal arterials (e.g., OR 213, OR 224, US 26, OR 99W); remove Damascus parkway designation and designate OR 212 from Sunrise Project to US 26 as principal arterial, but retain text box describing refinement planning that is underway through the OR 212 study and Damascus TSP; and consolidate all principal arterial designations into a single designation rather than reflecting different design types which will be identified in Figure 2.10.	Metro staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
318	RTP System Maps	Review and refine street design designations for North Denver, OR 99E north of Lombard and OR 99E north of Milwaukie.	Metro staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
319	RTP System Maps	Amend functional class map to include roads that connect the urban network to the rural network - SE Stark (257th to where it becomes rural arterial) SE Division and/or SE Powell Valley Rd (257th to where they become a rural arterial).	Multnomah County	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
320	RTP System Maps	Chapter 2, page 26, Figure 2.10, Regional Design Classifications and Page 33, Figure 2.12, Arterial and Throughway Network: correct inconsistencies between these two figures, e.g. a segment of TV Highway is designated a Highway on Figure 2.12, but a Street on Figure 2.10. The legend of Figure 2.10 should identify Freeways, Highways and Parkways as Throughways, and Boulevards and Streets as Arterials.	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested. Tualatin Valley Highway should be designated as a throughway design from Murray Boulevard to Brookwood, consistent with the principal arterial functional classification designation. The long-term classification of this route should be further considered as part of the TGM-funded corridor study for Tualatin Valley Highway.
321	RTP System Maps	Amend transit system map (Fig 2.15) to include all existing Frequent service plus lines included in 2010 TIP: new service in TIP includes: Line 76 -NEW (Beaverton TC to Tualatin), Line 31 – EXTENSION (Milwaukie TC to 152nd), Line 54 - EXTENSION (Beaverton TC to Scholls Ferry Rd.), Line 35 - NEW (Oregon City TC to Portland Mall), Line 12 - EXTENSION (Durham Rd. to Sherwood), Line 79 - NEW (Clackamas TC to Oregon City TC), and Line 87 – NEW (NE Sandy to SE Powell).	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
322	RTP System Maps	Amend transit system map (Fig. 2.15) to add new classification: "On-street BRT."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
323	RTP System Maps	Amend transit system map (Fig 2.15). Show new classification "On-Street BRT" along Powell to 92nd Ave and then cutting over to Division from 92nd to Gresham (replacing Divison's Frequent Bus designation east of 92nd). Also, show "On-Street BRT" along I-205 from Clackamas to Tualatin	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
324	RTP System Maps	Amend transit system map (Fig 2.15). Regional bus routing of line 67 appears to take an incorrect route. Also, delete line-work showing a regional bus route and major bus stop on 234th south of Tualatin Valley Highway. This is a map error.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
325	RTP- Policy	Pg. 58: (First paragraph) Freight rail is very important to our region. At the same time, long stretches of linear ROW is a rare commodity, and we should encourage that it be shared when possible. The language of this report should not assume a conflict between uses or that freight rail would suffer. We suggest the following change: "Freight rail is currently at or near capacity, and so has little room to handle more traffic without additional investment in rail mainlines, yard and siding capacity. These constraints will worsen as freight volumes at the region's ports and intermodal facilities increase. Right-of-way should be considered for multiple uses such as freight rail, passenger rail and trails, but analysis must include long-term needs for existing freight and freight rail expansion to ensure that necessary future capacity is not precluded."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested with this modification: last sentence should read: "Whenever right-of-way is considered for multiple uses such as freight rail, passenger rail and trails, analysis must include long-term needs for existing freight and freight rail expansion to ensure that necessary future capacity is not compromised."
326	RTP- Clarification (same issue on p. 1 of Freight Plan)	Pg. 53: The blue box states that "One of five statewide jobs relies on an effective transportation network for operations." One could argue that all jobs rely on an effective transportation network for operations. Be clear about what is being stated. Is it one in five statewide jobs relies on a transportation network to transport goods?	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested in both RTP and Freight Plan (p. 1)-- "One of five statewide jobs relies on an effective transportation network to move goods."
327	RTP-Freight Policy	suggestion is made to be more specific about green technologies, On page 58 of RTP Chapter 2.5.4, at the end of the sentence "It is important to ensure that the multimodal freight transportation system supports the health of the economy and the environment by pursuing clean, green and smart technologies and practices" add the words, "for example, by continuing to support/fund Cascade Sierra Solutions in providing diesel emission reduction technologies, etc."	City of Portland	10/15/09	Accept recommended change, with slight modification by adding new sentence following the last sentence on p. 58: "Details of the most promising technologies and practices will be developed as part of the Regional Freight Plan's elaboration of a freight action plan, as identified in Chapter 10 of that plan; however examples could include support for Cascade Sierra Solutions to provide diesel emission reduction technologies in the region."
328	TSMO plan	Corridor 10 - Revise description to Portland to Milwaukie LRT, recognize that the area's well-connected street network has been disrupted due to existing and historic railroad right-of-way,	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
329	TSMO plan	Corridor 11 - Add Railroad Avenue as a parallel arterial and note that mainline freight rail alignment is an additional barrier to street connectivity.	City of Milwaukie	10/14/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
330	Unresolved Issues	Add to section 5.8.10 Best Design practices in transportation recognizing that the update to the guidebooks will incorporate designs for low-volume bicycle boulevards, alternate designs for high volume arterial streets (e.g. cycle tracks) and regional trails. The guidelines will also address the added design elements that are needed when these facilities serve as a bicycle parkway route, e.g. bicycle priority treatments and strategies for avoiding bike/ped conflicts.	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
331	Unresolved Issues	Metro staff should research and recommend improved evaluation tools and criteria for policy-making and priority-setting in order to better understand how low-income, minority, disabled and elderly populations are being served by transportation policies & investment decisions.	Multnomah County, Coalition for a Livable Future	10/15/09	Amend Chapter 5 to add an unresolved issue, which describes that this follow-up work is needed prior to the next RTP update. This work will be a component of Metro's efforts to enhance the region's commitment to better address equity and federal Environmental Justice requirements.
332	Unresolved issues	A number of remaining tasks remain within a short timelines and limited resources. A consolidated task by task timeline of how the region gets to final adoption of the RTP in June 2010 would be helpful to have agencies plan for participation in the remaining work within Metro's available resources. If it is unrealistic, the timeline should be adjusted.	City of Beaverton, City of Portland, City of Tualatin	10/15/09, 10/15/09	Staff is working on this and bring a consolidated schedule and more detailed summary of tasks to be completed for consideration.
333	Unresolved issues	There are considerable unresolved issues identified in the draft plan. We urge these issues to be addressed before acceptance of the plan in Dec. '09 and final adoption in 2010. Commitments to address issues that cannot be resolved by Dec. '09 or 2010 must be included in the language that accepts and eventually adopts the plan.	City of Portland, Washington County	10/15/09	Staff is working on this and bring a consolidated schedule and more detailed summary of tasks to be completed for consideration.
334	Unresolved issues	The region should move forward with acceptance and final adoption of the RTP but commit to addressing the issues that cannot be resolved by Dec. '09 or final adoption in 2010 prior to the next RTP update.	TriMet, Multnomah County	10/15/09	No change needed. The region intends to implement the Regional Freight Plan in such a way as to retain companies like Sun Microsystems.

**2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
Summary of Comments Received and Recommendations - SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

(comments received September 15 through October 15, 2009)

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Public Review Draft and regional plans for freight, transportation system management and operations and high capacity transit were released for public review from September 15 – October 15, 2009. This document summarizes recommended changes to respond to substantive comments received in writing, at Metro Council public hearings and during discussions of the Metro Council and Metro advisory committees as part of the public comment period. This section includes changes that are recommended for approval as a package of consent items without further discussion.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
335	Glossary	Page 1 - Alternative Transportation Mode: We should be moving away from this term. It indicates that the primary mode of transportation is the auto and all others are secondary.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested to remove references to "alternative transportation modes" in glossary and throughout document.
336	Glossary	Pg. 3 - Revise Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) definition as follows, "Bus Rapid transit service uses high capacity buses in their own guide way or mixed in with traffic, with limited stops and a range of transit priority treatments to provide speed, frequency, and comfort to users. This service typically runs at least every 15 minutes during the weekday and weekend mid-day base periods <u>though frequencies may increase or decrease for individual applications and based on demand.</u> Stops are generally spaced one-quarter mile apart or more. Most stops have significant and <u>easily identifiable</u> passenger infrastructure, including waiting areas that are weather protected. Additional passenger amenities at stops may include real-time schedule information, trip planning kiosks, ticket machines, special lighting, benches, and bicycle parking."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
337	Glossary	Pg. 7: - Revise Frequent Bus definition as follows, "Frequent bus service <u>offers local and regional bus service with stops approximately every 750 to 1000 feet, that runs more frequently than bus rapid transit, but is slower because it makes more stops, providing corridor service rather than nodal service along selected arterial streets.</u> This service typically runs at least every 15-40 minutes <u>throughout the day and on weekdays though frequencies may increase based on demand.</u> and It can include transit preferential treatments, such as reserved bus lanes and transit signal priority, and enhanced passenger infrastructure along the corridor and at major bus stops, such as covered bus shelters, curb extensions, special lighting, and median stations."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
338	Glossary	<p>Pg. 11: Revise Light Rail Transit (LRT) definition as follows, "<u>In this region, Light Rail Transit (LRT) is TriMet's MAX service. A frequent Light Rail Transit (LRT) It is a system of modern passenger rail cars operating on a fixed guidway within an exclusive or semi-exclusive right-of-way, or in the street with mixed traffic, connecting the central city with regional centers. LRT serves the Central City and Regional Centers as well as also serves station communities and may serve town centers and corridors. and</u> In addition, LRT serves regional public attractions such as the Washington County Fair Grounds, Civic Stadium, the Oregon Convention Center, Oregon Zoo, Metropolitan Exposition Center and the Rose Garden. LRT service typically runs at least every 15 minutes during midday base periods throughout the day. It operates with limited stops and operates at higher speed outside of downtown Portland. <u>Light rail cars are commonly MAX is powered by overhead electric lines though some systems in other regions are powered by on-board diesel or electric motors. Main elements include rail vehicles, rail tracks, overhead electric lines, modern rail stations, signal priority at intersections, and integration with transit-oriented development strategies...</u>"</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
339	Glossary	<p>Pg. 12: Revise Local Bus definition as follows, "Local bus lines provide access to public transit within neighborhoods, commercial districts and some industrial areas, and often provide access to 2040 Target Areas and the remainder of the regional transit system. Local transit services are characterized by frequent stops along the route, <u>with stops spaced every 750 to 1000 feet.</u> Service levels vary, but often range from 30 to 60 minute headways through the day with more frequency during the peak periods to meet demand. Weekend and evening service levels are typically policy, not demand based.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
340	Glossary	<p>Pg. 12: Revise Local Transit Network as follows, "The local transit network provides basic service and access to <u>local neighborhoods and activity centers as well as</u> to the regional and high capacity transit networks. It also offers coverage and access to primary and secondary land-use components. Transit preferential treatments and passenger infrastructure are appropriate at high ridership locations. Sidewalk connectivity and protected crosswalks are critical elements of the local transit network. <u>This network includes local bus, para-transit, streetcar, and tram.</u>"</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
341	Glossary	Pg. 18: Revise Regional Bus as follows, "Bus service that operates on arterial streets with typical headways of 15 minutes during most of the day, though midday headways may drop to 30 minutes. Regional bus <u>may</u> operate seven days per week, <u>but not necessarily based on demand and policy</u> . <u>Stops are generally spaced every 750 to 1000 feet</u> . Transit preferential treatments and passenger infrastructure such as bus shelters, special lighting, transit signal priority and curb extensions are appropriate at <u>some</u> locations <u>such as those with high ridership</u> ."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
342	Glossary	Pg. 18: Revise Regional Transit Network as follows, "The network of transit operates primarily on arterial streets. <u>Most</u> services operate at intervals of 15-minute headways or better (all day and weekends when possible) <u>and is intended to operate at higher speeds to better serve longer trips</u> . This network also includes preferential treatments, such as transit signal priority and queue bypasses <u>and in some cases exclusive or limited-access lanes</u> . Supportive design treatments and enhanced passenger infrastructure such as covered bus shelters, curb extensions and special lighting are provided at regional transit stops and high ridership locations. This network includes: frequent bus, regional bus, streetcar, transit centers, park and ride lots and regional transit stops."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
343	Glossary	Pg. 19: Revise Regional Transit Stops as follow, "Transit stops that provide a high degree of transit passenger comfort and access. Regional transit stops are located at stops on light rail, commuter rail, rapid bus, frequent bus or streetcar lines in the central city, regional and town centers, main streets and corridors. Regional transit stops may also be located where bus lines intersect <u>providing transfer opportunites</u> or serve intermodal facilities, and <u>major destinations such as major hospitals, colleges and universities</u> . Regional transit stops may provide real-time schedule information, lighting, benches, shelters and trash cans. Other features may include real time information, special lighting or shelter design, public art and bicycle parking."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
344	Glossary	Pg. 21: Revise Streetcar as follows, "Fixed-route <u>guideway</u> transit service usually mixed in traffic for locally oriented trips within or between higher density mixed-use centers. Streetcar services provide local circulator service and has also served as a potent incentive for denser development in centers. Service runs typically every 15 minutes or better and streetcar routes may include transit preferential treatments, such as transit signal priority systems, and enhanced passenger infrastructure, such as covered real-time schedule information, bus shelters, curb extensions and special lighting. Streetcar is distinguished from <u>Rapid Streetcar (defined elsewhere) by its operation in generally mixed-traffic lanes and with relatively short stop spacing.</u> "	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
345	Existing conditions	Pg. 2: For each Chapter, consider listing the associated performance targets that are applicable to the chapter. This will help people understand what the target is and how or if the strategies relate to it.	TriMet	10/15/09	This comment will be addressed as part of finalizing the draft RTP in 2010. It may not be appropriate to list targets for each chapter, but it may be appropriate to link the targets to the system completion policies in Chapter 2 of the plan and the performance measures in Chapter 4.
346	Existing conditions	Pg. 12-19: The movement of freight is very important. There is also more to competing in a global economy than just moving freight efficiently. This section needs more discussion about what is required to make the region competitive. For example, creating a place where top talent and creative minded people is drawn is also important. Consider adding more supporting evidence to make this point.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
347	Existing conditions	<p>Pg. 22: "Participants in a fall 2006 stakeholder workshop that included people who live on the western edge of the Metro urban growth boundary related person experiences of their families, who must walk five miles or more on roads without sidewalks to reach the nearest transit stop. Participants also mentioned the lack of transit connections to other suburbs, where their jobs may be located."</p> <p>While anecdotal evidence is important to gather, it should not be used as primary supporting evidence of how transportation choices are limited. Ninety percent of the region's population is within a half mile of transit. Also, almost any trip can be accommodated with a transfer; not all trips can be accommodated on a single bus route. In our experience when people are concerned about transit coverage in their area, what they are really responding to is less-frequent service or service that requires transfers. In many cases, until and unless there are significant changes in built form, densities, and street and sidewalk connectivity that level of service is all that can be prudently provide.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested to provide additional supporting evidence.
348	Existing conditions	<p>Pg. 26: When discussing the Steel Bridge include pedestrian counts in your average daily traffic totals to provide a more complete picture of mobility across the bridge. If none are available, mention this and note that there is significant pedestrian traffic over the bridge.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested+F24.
349	Existing conditions	<p>Pg. 53: "The expected growth in motor vehicles on the system will increase the need for more and better pedestrian facilities and crossings." This causality seems incorrect. We want to reduce the expected growth in motor vehicle traffic and dramatically increase walking and biking by creating better pedestrian facilities and investing in demand management strategies. For example, the sentence would better read: <u>"If trends continue as they have, the expected growth in motor vehicles on our roads will inhibit the region's goal to become more walkable and bikable. We must begin to provide more and better pedestrian and bike facilities to encourage walking and biking."</u></p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
350	Existing conditions	<p>Pg. 54: In the paragraph on Regional bus service, it should refer to 12 frequent bus lines. When we combined names (example Division/Fessenden) this brought the total to 12.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
351	Performance Targets	Pg. 16: Are the interim regional modal targets for all trips or just for peak commute trips? We suggest breaking out the targets for each mode, rather than combining all "non-SOV" trips together into one category. By combining the non-SOV modes together, we do not have an accurate picture of how people are moving. If we want to increase less carbon-intensive modes of traveling, than we should set individual targets for pedestrian, bike, transit, and carpooling trips. An example target would be for each community to have a 20% pedestrian mode share, 15% bike mode share, and a 25% transit mode share.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend to clarify that the targets are for average daily trips. See Discussion item #1 on performance targets.
352	Policy	Pg. 20: Eight Regional Transportation System Components are listed in the breakout box. They should be listed in the order we would like to prioritize them. For example, if demand management is the first strategy in the congestion management toolbox, then make it the first component listed here. The regional throughway and street network should be listed last. There should be consistency in presenting priorities.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended. The order of the section is not intended to imply priorities.
353	Policy	Pg. 22: Under Centers and Main Streets the very first sentence states, "A diverse, walkable community depends on transportation infrastructure that provides a variety of ways to get around – serving pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit-users as well as drivers." Make it clear that Centers and Main Streets should be optimized for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
354	Policy	Pg. 23: Under Regional Mobility Corridor Concept the last paragraph states, "New throughway and arterial facilities, such as freeway interchanges or widened arterial streets, should not be a barrier to bicycling or walking." New throughway and arterial facilities are naturally barriers to bicycling or walking. The policy should state that widening of arterials should be minimized precisely because it discourages walking and biking, and if new freeway interchanges or other road improvements create a barrier, then design elements, like exclusive bike/pedestrian bridges and short, protected at-grade crossings where safe, should be incorporated to remove the barrier.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as follows, "New throughway and arterial facilities, such as freeway interchanges or widened arterial streets, should <u>be designed and constructed in such a manner as to not be a barrier support</u> to bicycling, <u>orwalking and access to transit.</u> "
355	Policy	Pg. 28: There needs to be more direction given on how to design for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. If this is a priority for the region, it deserves more in-depth discussion.	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended. More in-depth direction is included in Metro's livable streets handbooks and the pedestrian, bicycle and transit sections of this chapter.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
356	Policy	Pg. 30: The first policy "Build a well-connected network of complete streets" does not fully capture the need. Add the following: "...that prioritize safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access."	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
357	Policy	Pg. 33-34: The discussion should differentiate between the need to move trucks through the region vs. the need to move cars through the region. The plan needs to encourage the flow of truck traffic. More useful than counting the number of vehicles on a facility are measures that track how many people or amount/value of freight travel on a facility.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend discussion as requested. Current modeling tools limit the region's ability to measure the amount/value of freight travel on a facility. This is one of several areas that enhancements will be focused on in the future.
358	Policy	Pg. 43: Include Regional Transit Centers and Stations as a type of high capacity transit facility.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
359	Project	<p>Pg. 15: Figure 3.4 - the RTP Federal priorities by mode chart – shows close to 60% of projects and funding going toward throughways/roads/bridges and very little (1% of projects and less than 1% of funding) going toward ITS/TDM strategies. Furthermore, only 7% of funding is going toward bike/ped and trail improvements. The investment amounts do not match the priorities on walking, bicycling, and transit that other parts of the document emphasize.</p> <p>Pg. 17: Figure 3.6 – What types of projects fall under the "other solutions" category? In general, it would be helpful if you could provide examples of which projects fall under which categories. We suggest adding another column to Appendix A, stating which category the project falls into.</p> <p>Pg. 23: The RTP states, "Road and bridges comprise more than 50 percent of all the projects, but less than fifty percent of the total cost." This is not true if you calculate the roads, bridges, and throughways together. These categories should be counted together.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend this chapter to better describe different elements of the investment strategy. Future TSP updates will update existing projects and identify new projects to better address the policies emphasized in the RTP.
360	Implementation	Pg. 19: Please clarify: how do the RTP Implementation Benchmarks relate to (1) JPACT endorsed performance targets; (2) RTP system evaluation measures; (3) RTP system monitoring performance measures; and (4) Regional Performance Indicators?	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

SUPPLEMENTAL CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
361	Regional Transportation Functional Plan	<p>Define Needs: The functional plan appears to be focused primarily on how to facilitate the free-flow of automobile traffic. We suggest placing the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and create a more sustainable overall transportation system as the primary needs.</p> <p>Strategy # 1 of the Congestion Management Process: The first strategy of the congestion management process is to manage demand. This priority does not appear to be fully reflected in proposed investments. We suggest that Metro work with individual jurisdictions to seek opportunities to adjust this focus.</p> <p>“No More Than” and “Shall Allow”: These terms are suffused throughout the document. While it is important to note what the absolute minimum is to be in compliance, a different value is typically more ideal. Consider adding language to the functional plan that emphasizes preferred values or ranges, then supplement with the minimum or maximum. For example, in Design Standards for Street connectivity on page 5, item C.2 requires developments to have a plan that “Provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections...” This is a reasonable maximum, but a more ideal value is in the 200-300 foot range.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended. These comments will be addressed as part of finalizing the RTP in 2010.
362	Project	<p>Need to Better integrate and provide for Bicycles, Pedestrians, and Transit Planning: The project list includes many projects that widen roads while adding or at least maintaining bicycle lanes and sidewalks. While the bike lanes and sidewalks are important, they are also generally required. Wider street crossings, more lanes and turning lanes can serve to diminish the quality and safety of the bicycle and pedestrian environment. We urge more efforts to expand the list of projects that add and improve sidewalks, not just widen road facilities.</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	No change recommended. These comments have been forwarded to ODOT, cities, counties and the Port of Portland for consideration as part of finalizing recommended changes to the draft RTP as well as future TSP work the cities and counties will do as a follow-on to the RTP.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE)	RESOLUTION NO. 09-XXXX
DRAFT 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION)	
PLAN, WITH THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS,)	Introduced by Chief Operating Office Michael
FOR FINAL REVIEW AND ANALYSIS FOR AIR)	Jordan with the Concurrence of Council
QUALITY CONFORMANCE: THE TRANSPOR-)	President David Bragdon
TATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND)	
OPERATIONS ACTION PLAN; THE REGIONAL)	
FREIGHT PLAN; THE HIGH CAPACITY)	
TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN; AND THE)	
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL)	
PLAN)	

WHEREAS, federal and state law require Metro to adopt a transportation plan for the region and to revise it at least every four years to keep it up to date; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) is a central tool for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and is a policy component of the Regional Framework Plan; and

WHEREAS, Phase 1 of the RTP focused on development of the federally-recognized metropolitan plan for the Portland metropolitan region that serves as the threshold for all federal transportation funding in the region; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council adopted the federal component of the 2035 RTP by Resolution No. 07-3831B (For the Purpose of Approving the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis) on December 13, 2007, deferring adoption of the state component in order to address outstanding issues identified during development of the federal component; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council also deferred some technical analysis and policy development from its adoption of the federal component of the RTP; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Transportation approved the federal component of the 2035 RTP on March 5, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council accepted elements of the Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan by Resolution No. 09-4052 (For the Purpose of Accepting the Regional High Capacity Transit System Tiers and Corridors, System Expansion Policy Framework and Policy Amendments) for addition to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, Phase 2 of the RTP focused on development of the state component of the 2035 RTP; and

WHEREAS, the state component of the 2035 RTP is intended to serve as the regional transportation system plan under statewide planning Goal 12 and the state Transportation Planning Rule, and must be consistent with those laws; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 RTP must be consistent with other statewide planning goals and the state transportation system plan as contained in the Oregon Transportation Plan and its several components; and

WHEREAS, OAR 660-012-0016 directs coordination of the federally-required regional transportation plan in metropolitan areas with regional transportation system plans such that the state component of the 2035 RTP must be adopted within one year of the federal component or within a timeline and work program approved by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC); and

WHEREAS, on May 1, 2008, the LCDC accepted the RTP in the manner of periodic review and approved the work program and timeline for the state component of the RTP, which called for completing the RTP by December 2009, pending final review and analysis for air quality conformance; and

WHEREAS, central to the RTP is an overall emphasis on outcomes, system completeness and measurable performance to hold the region accountable for making progress toward the region's desired outcomes and state goals for reductions in vehicle miles traveled and corresponding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; and

WHEREAS, preliminary results from the analysis of recommended projects and programs show the draft RTP does not meet state targets for reductions in GHG emissions, showing increases from 2005; and

WHEREAS, national studies have suggested that transportation investments alone will not achieve required reductions in transportation-related GHG emissions, and that land use strategies and pricing techniques are critical components of any comprehensive strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, House Bill 2001, the comprehensive transportation package passed by the 2009 Oregon Legislature, requires Metro to "develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios" designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles by January 2012 and adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, the required scenario planning includes further development of tools and policies in Oregon than were anticipated in the draft RTP, and significant work program and scoping activities are continuing to be developed to respond to HB 2001 requirements; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC have recognized more work is needed to develop land use, transportation and pricing policies to address climate change and state targets to reduce GHG emissions; and

WHEREAS, preliminary results from the analysis of recommended projects and programs show the draft RTP is not expected to meet alternative mobility standards approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission in 2001; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC have recognized more work is needed to address alternative mobility standards as contained in the Oregon Highway Plan; and

WHEREAS, a 30-day public comment period was held on the state and federal component of the 2035 RTP from September 15 to October 15, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, JPACT, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (“MPAC”), the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (“MTAC”), the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (“TPAC”), the Regional Travel Options (“RTO”) subcommittee of TPAC, the Intelligent Transportation Systems (“ITS”) Subcommittee of TPAC, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Technical Advisory Committee, the Bi-State Coordination Committee, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, and other elected officials, representatives of business, environmental and transportation organizations from the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area assisted in the development of the state component of the RTP and provided comment on the RTP throughout the planning process; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC have recommended acceptance of the state and federal components of the 2035 RTP by the Metro Council for final review and air quality conformance analysis; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. Accepts the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) (Exhibit A to this resolution), with the following elements, for analysis of air quality conformance under federal law and for final review and public hearings:
 - The Transportation System Management and Operations Plan (Exhibit B to this resolution)
 - The Regional Freight Plan (Exhibit C to this resolution)
 - The High Capacity Transit System Plan (Exhibit D to this resolution)
 - The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (Exhibit E to this resolution).
2. Accepts the revisions to the federal component of the 2035 RTP to reflect additional technical analysis and policy development completed after adoption of Resolution No. 07-3831B.
3. Directs staff to consolidate the Draft 2035 RTP and the Summary of Public Comments received during the September 15 to October 15, 2009, comment period (Exhibits F and G to this resolution) into a single document for final public review.
4. Directs staff to prepare amendments to Exhibit E to this resolution and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to direct how local plans will implement the new RTP.
5. Directs staff to incorporate the new RTP policies and performance targets in the next policy update to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).
6. Directs staff to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by January 2012 as directed by the 2009 Legislature through House Bill 2001.
7. Directs staff to work with the ODOT and local governments to document the region’s inability to meet current alternative mobility standards in the Oregon Highway Plan and proposed actions to maintain state highway mobility “as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation.” This work will result in new alternative mobility standards, and policies and actions needed to meet them.
8. Declares that Resolution No. 09-XXXX does not adopt the state component of the 2035 RTP, or any of its elements and is not a land use decision. The resolution accepts the state and federal components of the 2035 RTP for final review and analysis, to be adopted by ordinance following public hearings in 2010.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this __ day of December, 2009

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

DRAFT

Rankings are Low Med High	Description	RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION MATRIX - DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION (October 30, 2009)													
		Portland Central City to Wilsonville, including Tiegard-Sherwood/Newberg/Tualatin, including I-5 South				Portland Central City Loop, including I-5/I-405 Downtown Loop		Clark County to I-5 Via Gateway, Oregon City and Tualatin, including I-205				Cities of East Multnomah County to Damascus (I-84/US 26 Connection)		Beaverton to Forest Grove (Tualatin Valley Highway)	
		2, 3 and 20				4		7, 8 and 9				15		24	
Mobility Corridors Involved	Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 20	Score	Corridor 4	Score	Corridor 7	Corridor 8	Corridor 9	Score	Corridor 15	Score	Data from Corridors 22/23	Score	
A: Consistency with State and Regional Plans/Policies															
A1: Previous refinement plan ratings/ranking (2001) INFORMATION ONLY-not included in scores	3	2	1	2.0	0	0.0	2	2	2	2.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	
A2: Previous refinement plan prioritization ratings/ranking (2005)	2	3	3	2.7	3	3.0	3	2	2	2.3	3	3.0	1	1.0	
A3: Support Region 2040 (# of primary land uses in corridor - PDX CBD, Regional Centers, Industrial Centers, Freight/Passenger intermodal)	Corridors considered together			2.0	2	2.0	Corridors considered together			3.0	2	2.0	1	1.0	
A4: High Capacity Transit Plan ranking	Corridors considered together			3.0	0	0.0	Corridors considered together			2.0	1	1.0	2	2.0	
A5: Regional Freight Plan consistency	Corridors considered together			3.0	3	3.0	Corridors considered together			2.0	3	3.0	1	1.0	
B: Environment															
B1: Pedestrian network gap (% of sidewalks in pedestrian districts/corridors, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	2	1	2	1.7	1	1.6	2	2	2	2.0	2	2.0	2/3	2.5	
B2: Transit coverage (% of households/% of jobs covered by 15 min transit service, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	3/2	3/3	3/3	2.8	1/1	1.0	3/2	2/2	1/2	2.0	2/2	2.0	HH (2/1) Jobs (2/2)	1.8	
B3: Street connectivity (# of intersections/square mile, 2005)	3	3	3	3.0	1	1.0	3	3	2	2.7	3	3.0	3/3	3.0	
B4: Bicycle Network Gap -- length of gap (feet) per household, 2005)	2	2	2	2.0	2	2.0	3	2	2	2.3	3	3.0	2/3	2.5	
B5: Traffic volumes on corridor throughways and arterials	3	3	3	3.0	3	3.0	3	3	2	2.7	2	2.0	2	2.0	
C: Equity															
C1: Number of low-income, senior and disabled, and minority and/or Hispanic population in corridor	2	1	1	1.3	2	2.0	1	2	2	1.7	2	2.0	3/2	2.5	
D: Economy (includes system performance as well as economic indicators)															
D1: Congestion (volume to capacity ratios for regional throughways and arterial streets (2005)	3	3	2	2.7	3	3.0	3	3	3	3.0	1	1.0	3	3.0	
D2: Safety (# of top accident locations, SPIS data 2007)	3	3	3	3.0	3	3.0	2	3	3	2.7	1	1.0	3	3.0	
D3: Total corridor households (2005)	3	2	1	2.0	2	2.0	1	3	2	2.0	2	2.0	3/1	2.0	
D4: Total corridor households (2035)	2	2	1	1.7	2	2.0	1	3	1	1.7	2	2.0	3/1	2.0	
D5: Total corridor jobs (2005)	2	1	1	1.3	3	3.0	1	2	1	1.3	1	2.0	2/1	1.5	
D6: Total corridor jobs (2035)	2	2	1	1.7	3	3.0	1	2	1	1.3	2	2.0	3/1	2.0	
D7: Freight volume (trucks) as percentage of total volume - 2005 (highest % of total) (0-5% = 1; 6-10% = 2; > 10=3)	3	3	2	2.7	2	2.0	3	2	2	2.3	1	1.0	1/2	1.5	
SUBTOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES				39.5		36.6				37.0		34.0		34.3	
E: Local Commitment and Support [INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, DUE NOVEMBER 2, 2009]															
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support															
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration															
E3: Compatible with locally adopted land use & transportation plans (need for land use certainty; need to support local aspirations)															
E4: Commitment to monetary or in-kind support of refinement plan															
SUBTOTAL--LOCAL SUPPORT & COMMITMENT SCORES				0.0		0.0				0.0		0.0		0.0	
GRAND TOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES				39.5		36.6				37.0		34.0		34.3	

Description	Mobility Corridors Involved	Data Sources	2, 3 and 20			4	7, 8 and 9			15	24
			Corridor 2	Corridor 3	Corridor 20	Corridor 4	Corridor 7	Corridor 8	Corridor 9	Corridor 15	Data from Corridors 22/23
A: Consistency with State and Regional Plans/Policies											
A1: Previous refinement plan ratings/ranking (2001) INFORMATION ONLY-not included in scores	Metro Memo (2001)		3	2	1	0	2	2	2	1	2
A2: Previous refinement plan prioritization ratings/ranking (2005)	Metro Memo (2005 ranking)		2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	1
A3: Support Region 2040 (# of primary land uses in corridor - PDX CBD, Regional Centers, Industrial Centers, Freight/Passenger intermodal)	Mobility Atlas		2	1	1	4	2	4	2	4	3
A4: High Capacity Transit Plan (ranking)	HCT Priority Tiers		3			0	2			1	2
A5: Regional Freight Plan consistency	Plan Narrative (Ranking)		3			3	2			3	1
B: Environment											
B1: Pedestrian network gap (% of sidewalks in pedestrian districts/corridors, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	Mobility Atlas		40%/46%	75%/67%	61%/59% (56.5% Corridor Average)	83.9%/81%	37.2%	57.7%	61.6% (52.3% Corridor Average)	50.1%/74.3 (62.2% Average)	63.5/19.2%; (41.4% Average)
B2: Transit coverage (% of households/% of jobs covered by 15 min transit service, 2005) <34% average = 3; 34-66% average = 2; > 66% average = 1	Mobility Atlas		HH: 27.9%; Jobs: 50.3%	HH: 3.6%; Jobs: 4.6%	HH: 13.3%; Jobs: 8.1%	HH: 92%; Jobs: 97.8%	HH: 17.7%; Jobs: 38.1%	HH: 52.8%; Jobs: 49.5%	HH: 71.9%; Jobs: 58.6%	HH: 34.1%; Jobs: 44.3%	HH: 38.5%/27.8% Jobs: 53.5%/43.2%
B3: Street connectivity (# of intersections/square mile, 2005)	Mobility Atlas + Metro TAZ modeling output		104	26	51	273	23	116	95	42	53/21
B4: Bicycle Network Gap – length of gap (feet) per household, 2005)	Mobility Atlas		158,241	70,979	38,018	124,363	105,069	231,220	77,635	187,113	249,914/16,950
B5: Traffic volumes on corridor throughways and arterials	Mobility Atlas (Ranking)		3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
C: Equity											
C1: Number of low-income, senior and disabled, and minority and/or Hispanic population in corridor	Census 2000		7,035	3,059	771	8,661	1,509	8,442	5,913	5,731	25,094/7,440
D: Economy (includes system performance as well as economic indicators)											
D1: Congestion (volume to capacity ratios for regional throughways and arterial streets (2005)	ODOT DATA		3	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	3
D2: Safety (# of top accident locations, SPIS data 2007)	ODOT DATA		3	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	3
D3: Total corridor households (2005)	Metro TAZ Modeling output		78,914	36,720	21,707	59,158	28,930	98,960	37,767	57,265	107,422/15,160
D4: Total corridor households (2035)	Metro TAZ Modeling output		116,916	78,663	49,731	103,104	58,686	129,610	45,326	97,727	167,240/22,138
D5: Total corridor jobs (2005)	Metro TAZ Modeling output		131,549	62,534	51,804	259,746	34,930	102,281	65,846	57,381	156,953/14,410
D6: Total corridor jobs (2035)	Metro TAZ Modeling output		219,370	119,504	102,717	374,445	63,497	162,177	94,954	125,225	305,844/22503
D7: Freight volume (trucks) as percentage of total volume - 2005 (highest % of total) (0-5% = 1; 6-10% = 2; > 10=3)	Mobility Atlas		10.20%	16.20%	9.20%	9.70%	11.20%	7.90%	9.70%	3.40%	1.9%(7.1% NW Zion Church)
E: Local Commitment and Support [INFORMATION TO BE SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, DUE NOVEMBER 2, 2009]											
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support	Letter										
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration	Letter										
E3: Compatible with locally adopted land use & transportation plans (need for land use certainty; need to support local aspirations)	Letter										
E4: Commitment to monetary or in-kind support of refinement plan	Letter										

Discussion Item #2 - Attachment 1

I. Proposed amendments to regional-level performance targets

MPAC discussed the performance targets proposed in the draft RTP and identified several refinements on October 23 and October 28. A summary of the discussions and rationale for the proposed amendments are provided below for consideration.

JPACT-Endorsed Draft Performance Targets *(transportation performance targets only)*

Economy	Safety – By 2035, reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities <u>per capita</u> by 50 percent compared to 2005.
	Congestion – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
	Freight reliability – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per truck by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Environment	Climate change – By 2035, reduce <u>transportation-related</u> carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.
	Active transportation – By 2035, triple the share of walking, biking and transit trips <u>mode share</u> compared to 2005.
	Clean air – By 2035, ensure zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.
	Travel – By 2035, reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Equity	Affordability – By 2035, reduce <u>the share of average households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income</u> combined cost of <u>on housing and transportation</u> by 25 percent combined compared to 2000.
	Access to daily needs – By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations ¹ accessible within 30 minutes by <u>trails, bicycling and public transit</u> or <u>within 15 minutes by sidewalks</u> for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations <u>relative to the general population</u> compared to 2005.

Safety - MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff normalize this target to recognize the region’s growing population and account for all transportation users.

Climate change - MPAC discussed this target and recommended that “transportation-related” be added to the target to be clear this is focused on transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.

¹ Consistent with the evaluation methodology used for the High Capacity Transit plan, essential destinations are defined as: hospitals and medical centers, major retail sites, grocery stores, elementary, middle and high schools, pharmacies, major social service centers (with more than 200 monthly LIFT pick-up counts), colleges and universities, employers with greater than 1,500 employees, sports and attraction sites and major government sites.

Discussion Item #2 - Attachment 1

Active transportation - MPAC discussed this target and recommended the target call for tripling the share of trips made by each mode of travel instead of the number of trips made by each mode. MPAC also recommended targets be set for each mode rather than as an aggregate as proposed. Staff recommends the target be revised to call for tripling the share of trips made by walking, bicycling and transit.

Travel - MPAC discussed this target and recommended staff to consider whether the target should be more aggressive given the connection of reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per person to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Federal legislation has called for a 16 percent reduction in VMT per person given forecasted growth in population and economic activity, which will result in continued growth in overall VMT in the region. A more aggressive target is not recommended at this time, this should be considered as part of the climate change scenarios work that follows the RTP update.

Affordability - MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council discussed this target and have recommended the target be revised to call for a reduction in the percent of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of income on housing and transportation combined.

Access to Daily Needs - MPAC discussed this target and recommended the target be revised to include "trails" and "sidewalks" and to report the information at a regional-level as well as for traditionally disadvantaged populations. MPAC recognized the importance of tracking progress toward improving access and the number of transportation options available to low-income and minority populations, but also felt it was important to improve access and options for everyone. An equity analysis will help ensure low-income and minority populations share in the benefits of transportation investments without bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. The analysis will also help the region meet federal Civil Rights and environmental justice policies through the long-range transportation planning process. In addition, MPAC recommended inclusion of other destinations that are important to have access to in order to meet one's daily needs.

II. **Application of regional-level performance targets to projects**

MPAC discussed the need to explore how the regional-level performance targets could be applied to projects to ensure local and regional investment priorities implement the new RTP policies, particularly the greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. MPAC identified three recommendations for addressing this:

- (1) Monitor the regional-level performance targets as part of periodic updates to the RTP.
- (2) Direct local governments to adopt the new RTP policies and performance targets in local plans and to evaluate local transportation system plan (TSP) performance relative to the performance targets.
- (3) Identify what RTP policies and performance targets to emphasize and criteria for evaluating individual projects in the next policy update to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The next update is scheduled to begin in winter 2010.



Date: October 30, 2009

To: TPAC, MTAC and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments –TriMet Amendments – RECOMMENDATION REQUESTED

On October 28, TriMet introduced additional amendments to be considered as part of finalizing the draft RTP. The amendments are consistent with the RTP policies and are recommended for approval as part of Exhibit G (Consent Items for Consideration). MTAC and TPAC are requested to make a recommendation on the proposed amendments.

TriMet Recommended Amendments to Draft RTP

Amend Objective 4.4 Demand Management as follows:

“Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to dramatically increase awareness of travel options walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling.”

- *It’s not just awareness but actual use of other modes that matters.*

Amend Objective 4.5 Value Pricing as follows:

“Objective 4.5 Value Pricing – ~~Consider and selectively~~ Promote as appropriate a broader application of value pricing as a ~~potential~~ management tool.”

- *We know that pricing is one of the most effective management strategies. Pricing affects transportation choices today. We need to employ pricing to achieve our objectives.*

Amend 2.3.1 Performance Targets section, Table 2.3 as follows:

“Active transportation – By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit ~~trips~~ mode share compared to 2005.”

- *With hundreds of thousands of more people moving to region we need achieve a higher proportion of non-auto trips. The difference will be substantial, and the target should be for the higher number.*

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2008-) RESOLUTION NO. 09-XXXX
11 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION)
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD) Introduced by Councilor Carlotta Collette
THE SW MOODY AVENUE WIDENING AND)
HARBOR DRIVE/RIVER PARKWAY)
INTERSECTION PROJECTS AND ELIMINATE)
THE I-5 @ NORTH MACADAM ACCESS)
PROJECT)

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) prioritizes projects from the Regional Transportation Plan to receive transportation related funding; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council must approve the MTIP and any subsequent amendments to add new projects to the MTIP; and

WHEREAS, the JPACT and the Metro Council approved the 2008-11 MTIP on August 16, 2007; and

WHEREAS, the Cit of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) were awarded federal High Priority Project funding and Oregon Transportation Investment Act funding for a new access ramp from I-5 northbound to Macadam Avenue and the South Waterfront district; and

WHEREAS, the cost of such a project has escalated beyond the ability for those agencies to design and construct the project within; and

WHEREAS, these agencies have defined two local agency projects: SW Moody Avenue widening and Harbor Drive – River Parkway intersection project, that serve the same objective of increasing access to the South Waterfront area from I-5 northbound; and

WHEREAS, the SW Moody Avenue and Harbor Drive – River Parkway intersection projects are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, these changes to programming for these projects has been shared with state and federal air quality agency staff and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and found consistent with the State Implementation Plan for air quality; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby adopts the recommendation of JPACT to modify the programming of the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to eliminate funding for the I-5/South Waterfront Access project and establish funding for the SW Moody Avenue widening project and the Naito Parkway – River Parkway intersection project, as shown in Exhibit A.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of November 2009.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Exhibit A

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Table 4.1.1 amendment

Existing Programming

Sponsor	Metro ID No.	Project Name	Project Description	Funding Source	Project Phase	2009	2010	2011
ODOT		Interstate 5 @ North Macadam	New access ramp from I-5 northbound to the North Macadam district.	HPP	PE	\$1,980,000		
				OTIA-3	PE	\$2,020,000		
				OTIA-3	Construction			\$12,980,000
				Local	Construction			\$13,020,000

Amended Programming

Sponsor	Metro ID No.	Project Name	Project Description	Funding Source	Project Phase	2009	2010	2011
City of Portland		SW Harbor Drive/SW River Parkway Improvements	Add turn lanes at intersection to increase vehicle capacity access to the South Waterfront district.	OTIA-3	PE	\$1,016,000		
					ROW/Utilities		\$1,900,000	
					Construction			\$84,000
				Local	Construction			\$2,389,000
City of Portland		SW Moody Avenue: SW River Parkway – SW Gibbs Street	Widen Moody Avenue to 5 lanes, and add sidewalks and bike lanes.	HPP	PE	\$1,980,000		
				OTIA-3	PE	\$3,780,000		
				OTIA-3	Construction			\$8,220,000
				Local	Construction			\$10,020,000

Exhibit B

Air Quality Conformity for Resolution 09-YYYY

The City of Portland and ODOT are requesting an amendment to the MTIP to swap funding from a project to provide a new access ramp from I-5 northbound to Macadam Avenue and the South Waterfront area - to two local projects at the Harbor Drive/River Parkway intersections and Moody Avenue widening. In the interim, SW Moody will function as a two-way street. As the South Waterfront District continues to develop, the extension of SW Bond to the north will need to be completed and, at that time, SW Moody and SW Bond will function as a couplet – SW Moody handling southbound traffic and SW Bond handling northbound traffic.

We are asking for your review and concurrence with this substitution as not regionally significant and not requiring further air quality consideration for the following reasons:

- 1) The two local projects would provide much improved accessibility to the same area that the conformed flyover project would and are therefore considered a being roughly equivalent with regard to air quality at the regional level;
- 2) The projects would include federal funding, so “hot spot” analysis of Carbon Monoxide would still have to be performed to demonstrate that the localized area would meet air quality standards prior to construction;
- 3) The projects will be included in the air quality conformity determination to be completed for the Metro 2035 RTP update in about six months.

Below is the table from the 2035 RTP conformity determination:

Year	Carbon Monoxide Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (Budgets are Maximum Allowed Emissions) (pounds/ winter day)	Forecast Carbon Monoxide Motor Vehicle Emissions (pounds/ winter day)
2007	N/A	935,394
2010	1,033,578	856,054
2017	1,181,341	670,926
2025	1,181,341	801,203
2035	1,181,341	822,596

Metro forecasts a total average weekday total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the Metro urban growth boundary of 20,044,778 miles in the year 2005 and 27,084,711 miles in 2035 – though VMT/capita is forecast to drop from 14.23 in 2005 to 13.28. It is reasonable to assume the substituting projects are in the same vicinity of the replaced project and provide similar access, that these would make very little change to overall VMT or VMT per capita for the region.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 09-YYYY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2008-11 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ADD THE SW MOODY AVENUE WIDENING AND HARBOR DRIVE/RIVER PARKWAY INTERSECTION PROJECTS AND ELIMINATE THE I-5 @ NORTH MACADAM ACCESS PROJECT

Date: November XX, 2009

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The I-5 North Macadam project was initiated in 2003 to enhance access, accommodate growth and improve safety in the South Waterfront District, a highly dense, mixed use District south of the Central Business District of Portland. The project envisioned the construction of a “flyover” ramp to correct the weave-merge configuration with the exit ramp and northbound Macadam (OR-43) traffic.

The City of Portland received \$15 Million OTIA III Modernization funds in 2003 with matching funds from the City and a 2006 Federal Appropriation, bringing the total project budget to \$30 Million. However, the cost of the flyover project in 2007 was estimated to be double the original budget (\$60 Million), so the City of Portland and The Oregon Department of Transportation worked together to develop alternative solutions that met the project goals of “enhance access, accommodate growth and improve safety” in the Waterfront District within the budget of \$30 Million. After extensive evaluation it was decided by PDOT and ODOT that the best option for achieving our objectives within our budget is to move forward with two local agency projects to improve access to the district at SW Harbor Dr/SW River Parkway and improve SW Moody Ave: SW River Parkway – SW Gibbs St to accommodate the additional traffic volumes. Exhibit A demonstrates the changes to MTIP programming.

These changes to the programming for these projects has been shared with state and federal air quality agency staff and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and found consistent with the State Implementation Plan for air quality.

This recommendation to modify MTIP programming for these projects was adopted, along with recommendation for the other ODOT regions in the state, by the OTC at their October meeting. The State and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plans now need to be amended to reflect these changes.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition** None known at this time.
- 2. Legal Antecedents** Amends the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program adopted by Metro Council Resolution 07-3825 on August 16, 2007 (For the Purpose of Approving the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland Metropolitan Area).
- 3. Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution would modify the programming of the 2008-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to eliminate funding for the I-5/South Waterfront Access project and establish funding for the SW Moody Avenue widening project and the Naito Parkway – River Parkway intersection project.

4. Budget Impacts None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Metro staff recommends the approval of Resolution No. 09-YYYY

2009-10 JPACT Work Program

10/30/09

<p><u>November 12, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></p> <p>Note: JPACT meeting will begin at 7:15 a.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion/direction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RTP Performance Targets 2. Corridor refinement plan priorities 3. Public comment log • Sunrise Project Preferred Alternative - Action 	<p><u>December 10, 2009 – Regular Meeting</u></p> <p>Note: JPACT meeting will begin at 7:15 a.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Accept” 2035 draft RTP Adoption Package, Pending Air quality Conformity – Action
<p><u>January 14, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal priorities • Climate change and Global Warming Commission announcement 	<p><u>February 11, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTO evaluation results - presentation by Dr. Jennifer Dill, PSU • RTO work plan and budget for FY 2010-11 <p><u>February 2010 – JPACT Retreat (Tentative)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Change Prosperity Project review • Greenhouse gas, University of Oregon climate change study, etc.
<p><u>March 4, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p> <p><u>March 9th – 11th – JPACT Washington, DC Trip</u></p>	<p><u>April 8, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>
<p><u>May 13, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>	<p><u>June 10, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>
<p><u>July 8, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>	<p><u>August 12, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>
<p><u>September 2, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>	<p><u>October 14, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>
<p><u>November 4, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>	<p><u>December 9, 2010 – Regular Meeting</u></p>

Parking Lot:

- When to consider LPA/RTP actions for I-5/99W
- Update on House Bill 2001
- Request to the Oregon Transportation Commission to amend the mobility policy

Shift the Balance on Transportation:

Coalition for a Livable Future's Analysis of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update



Introduction

The transportation system impacts our ability to get to the places we need and want to go and travel in ways that support our health and well-being. Yet over the last 50 years, we have invested primarily in one mode of travel – the car – leading to limited choices in how we travel. This unbalanced investment strategy has negatively affected our towns, the environment, and public health, particularly in low income communities and communities of color. It has also contributed to the climate crisis, as roughly 40% of global warming pollution comes from driving.

Coalition for a Livable Future believes we need to shift the balance in transportation spending in order to create a healthier, more prosperous and sustainable region for everyone. Rather than focus on cars, the transportation system should instead focus on supporting people and communities. Our transportation system should benefit communities equitably to ensure that all communities have high-quality access to work, school, shopping and recreation. It should also support vibrant public spaces; address the climate crisis; support public health; and protect our farms, forests, and natural resources.

To create a more balanced transportation system, we must invest heavily in transit, bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails to give people more choices in how they travel and create opportunities for healthy living and active lifestyles. Increased safety and reduced noise should be high priorities. Jobs, public spaces, parks, and affordable housing should be in proximity to each other and close to transit to ensure that people of all incomes and abilities are able to get to work, access healthy food, and reach their destinations reliably and affordably. Road planning should prioritize an interconnected system of complete streets that give people choices in how they travel rather than a system that funnels cars into oversized roadways that are bound to become congested and create toxic air hot spots.

Table of Contents

1	<i>Executive Summary</i>	1
2	<i>Policy and Practice in the Regional Transportation Plan</i>	2
	Goals of Transportation System	2
3	<i>Key Findings and Recommendations</i>	3
	Findings	3
	Recommendations	5
4	<i>Methodology for Project Evaluation</i>	7
5	<i>Local Project Evaluations</i>	8
	Washington County	8
	Hillsboro	9
	Tualatin	10
	Clackamas County	10
	Milwaukie	12
	Happy Valley	12
	Multnomah County	13
	Portland	13
	Port of Portland	16
	TriMet	16
	Oregon Department of Transportation	18

1. Executive Summary

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) guides how the Portland metropolitan area will invest \$14-20 Billion in transportation projects over the next 25 years. The decisions Metro and its city and county partners make through the RTP will have a major impact on how the region grows and whether it thrives.

Metro's RTP goals include addressing the climate crisis, creating opportunities for healthy and active living, ensuring people travel safely, and addressing equity and environmental justice, and protecting the environment. These goals are a positive step. However, the list of projects submitted by jurisdictions for the RTP does not appear to meet Metro's goals, and there is no system of accountability to ensure that the final list of approved projects will meet the goals.

The RTP overinvests in road expansions, leaving little funding for lower cost projects that better support the RTP goals, including bike lanes, sidewalks, trails, transit, and programs for making the transportation work more efficiently.

The current plan increases global warming pollution. The transportation system needs to address the climate crisis, as roughly 40% of global warming pollution in Oregon comes from driving. This result is unacceptable. We need an RTP that creates transportation choices for people and reduces the amount people need to drive.

Three quarters of all road funding is for expansions to the existing system for vehicles, and even without the Columbia River Crossing, whose size dwarfs all other investments, two thirds of all road funding is for expansions. *This massive road expansion plan will undermine Metro's goals* because they increase global warming pollution, add traffic, encourage low-density development, increase air toxics, and discourage walking and biking.

We must invest much more in transit, bike lanes, sidewalks and trails to give people choices in how they travel, reduce pollution and create opportunities for healthy and active living. Road investment should focus on filling in gaps in street networks so that traffic is more evenly dispersed, and completing existing streets to give people choices in how they travel.

The region should invest in projects that increase safety and dramatically reduce the number of traffic fatalities in our communities.

Jobs, public spaces, parks, and affordable housing should be near each other and close to transit, so people of all incomes and abilities would be able to get to work, access healthy food, and reach their destinations reliably and affordably.

Equity is invisible in the process. Metro should require more information on whether the projects and the system they create advance equity. Our transportation system should increase opportunities for all communities through improvements in transportation, job training and accessibility, and a greater degree of equality in our region.

The Columbia River Crossing megabridge project should not be in the RTP. The CRC is a massive freeway bridge/ interchange building effort that will increase driving, exacerbate the climate crisis, and worsen air quality in neighborhoods near I-5 and I-205. The CRC would exacerbate current bottlenecks at the junction of I-5 and I-405 and I-5 at the Rose Quarter, leading to gridlock in the heart of Portland and forcing the consideration of additional freeway expansions. The financial cost of the CRC is so high it diverts a massive amount of our limited transportation resources with huge negative impacts and without providing benefits that come close to its cost.

2. Policy and Practice in the Regional Transportation Plan

The overarching question asked by this report is how well the set of projects being proposed for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update moves us toward a more balanced transportation system for a healthier, greener, and more prosperous future.

The RTP guides how the Portland metropolitan area will invest an estimated \$14-20 Billion in transportation projects over the next 25 years. The decisions made Metro and the jurisdictions in the region (Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties, the 26 cities in these three counties, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Port of Portland, TriMet and SMART) will have a major impact on how the region grows and whether it thrives socially, economically, and environmentally.

Coalition for a Livable Future has been involved in Metro's 2035 RTP update since the beginning of the process, helping Metro refine the policy framework that is supposed to guide decisions about which transportation projects are built.

The goals that make up this new policy framework go a long way toward meeting Coalition for a Livable Future's vision for the region. The goals are grounded in Metro's intention to address climate change, create affordable housing near public transportation, create opportunities for healthy and active living, address equity and environmental justice, and protect the environment (see figure 1). They were also used to create performance targets that will measure how the region is succeeding.

While the goals are laudable, goals do not make up the transportation system; projects

do. Coalition for a Livable Future is concerned because the list of projects submitted by jurisdictions does not appear to match the goals, and we see little accountability to ensure that the projects that make up the regional transportation system reflect the values of the region.

This report begins to address the disconnect between policy and practice. It evaluates how effectively the proposed RTP projects support Metro's vision for a smarter, fairer, more environmentally sound transportation system.

Goals of Transportation System

as adopted by Metro

Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form

Goal 2: Sustain Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity

Goal 3: Expand Transportation Choices

Goal 4: Emphasize Effective and Efficient Management of the Transportation System

Goal 5: Enhance Safety and Security

Goal 6: Promote Environmental Stewardship

Goal 7: Enhance Human Health

Goal 8: Ensure Equity

Goal 9: Ensure Fiscal Stewardship

Goal 10: Deliver Accountability


3. Key Findings and Recommendations

- The goals of the RTP are strong and appropriately focus on ensuring that the transportation system fosters health, equity, and the environment. However, the list of projects is poorly linked to the goals, making it impossible to tell whether individual projects reflect best efforts to achieve the goals.


- Projects that are inconsistent with adopted regional goals remain on RTP project lists, reflecting a lack of accountability to regional goals.

- o Three quarters of all road projects expand the roadway for cars. Even without the Columbia River Crossing, whose size dwarfs all other investments, two thirds of all road projects are expansions.


- o Road expansions appear prominently on several jurisdiction project lists, even though most of these types of projects lead to additional traffic, poor land use patterns, increased air toxics, global warming pollution, and inequitable investment. Road investment should instead focus on filling in gaps in street networks so that traffic is more evenly dispersed, and completing existing streets to give people choices in how they travel. These investments also fail to address the transportation needs of underserved communities, especially individuals and families who do not own cars.



o Local plans (Local Transportation System Plans, or TSPs) have not been updated to reflect the new policy goals, and some positive changes will likely occur as new local plans are adopted. However, the disconnect between goals and projects reflects a larger issue than the time lag between the RTP update and TSP updates. Instead, we believe jurisdictions are not equally and fully supportive of choosing transportation investments that support regional goals and a multimodal transportation system. The current goals do not reflect a sea-change in values, as the region has long supported development of thriving neighborhoods and a focus on centers and corridors.



- The proposed system – that is, the overall list of projects – will not reduce global warming pollution. In 2008, Metro analyzed several scenarios to assess the relative effectiveness of different tools and investment strategies. The various scenarios compared heavy investment in transit, street connectivity, throughways, and programs and technology for managing the system to increase efficiency (including congestion pricing). While investment in transit slowed growth of greenhouse gas emissions compared to the other scenarios, none of the scenarios led to an overall decrease in global warming pollution.
- Equity is especially absent from the list of projects. It is impossible to tell whether, and to what extent, investments will benefit historically underserved and disenfranchised communities whose transportation needs are greatest. It is imperative that more money must be focused on these communities to address disparities in service so that all communities benefit from the transportation system.



Key Recommendations

1. Additional information on each of the projects and how they support the RTP goals should be required for a meaningful and transparent public process and to support the designation of good projects. The information that Metro requires local jurisdictions to submit with their lists is inadequate to truly assess the projects.

Project descriptions are one line long and usually give little to no information regarding how the projects serve community and regional needs. Two particularly uninformative descriptions provide no information on project location, simply reading: "Address safety and congestion issues; miscellaneous locations."

2. Metro should evaluate projects based on RTP goals, using evaluations to prioritize funding, as was done to evaluate Regional Flexible Fund Projects in the MTIP¹. While no process is imperfect, the MTIP process provides a starting point for assessment of issues including how investments support low income, seniors, and people with disabilities, impact transit ridership, address gaps in multi-modal, mixed-use areas, and reduce global warming pollution.

3. Jurisdictions should be provided sufficient time and tools to adequately assess how their lists reflect the new framework.

4. Metro has a strong history of using citizen committees to guide and inform policy decisions. While there were some opportunities for citizens to influence the RTP, the RTP begs for a more thoughtful and sustained citizen involvement process for such a complex and important resource allocation.

In particular, JPACT and possibly MPAC should convene subcommittees on equity and global warming, as these are identified as high priority goals within the RTP framework.

5. After analysis of the project list using the performance measures, Metro should:

a. Allow public comment so that the public is able to comment with essential information in hand on how well the projects reflect regional goals.

b. Allow time and tools for jurisdictions to change their project lists to address issues that arise in performance evaluations.

6. A general financial break-down should be required of projects serving more than one mode in order to determine the scope and scale of investments in different modes – bike, pedestrian, transit or auto – on any given project.

a. The community should be skeptical of projects that mention bike, pedestrian, and transit access improvements in project descriptions without more detailed information on the breakdown of project costs. The regional culture has taught jurisdictions that mentioning alternative modes in a project is likely to be viewed favorably even though the actual investment in non-auto-focused improvements will be incidental to the overall scale of the project.

7. A system to encourage or require jurisdictions to remove outdated projects from lists should be created, allowing more projects that meet regional goals to be included.

¹ The evaluation process is available in the Solicitation Packet for the 2010-2013 Regional Flexible Fund Projects in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), at Metro's website under Regional Flexible Funding. www.metro-region.org.

8. We appreciate Metro’s work in developing performance measures, as evaluation of the regional system will yield important information on the overall performance of the system. However, these measures should be used not only to assess the entire system, but also to assess the impact of various projects on system performance. While the performance measures may not be sensitive enough to assess finely grained areas, we hope they can be used and further refined to analyze the impact of project choices.

9. Metro has frequently demonstrated the importance of an integrated approach to land use, transportation, housing affordability, and employment strategies, and has indicated the connection between land use and transportation planning by incorporating both Urban and Rural Reserves and the RTP into the Making the Greatest Place process. However, it is not enough to merely present these efforts under the Making the Greatest Place umbrella —there needs to be a demonstrable integration of the various decisions within each of the facets of this effort. Metro should analyze how proposed transportation investments will impact land use in the UGB and in proposed Urban and Rural Reserves.

10. In order to understand the full picture of transportation investments, analyze all investments together, not just those included in the RTP. Maintenance and operations are not included in the RTP, which lead to an incomplete picture of the system. Without seeing road maintenance, it is impossible to determine whether investments equitably serve all communities. The omission of operations is particularly problematic in the case of TriMet, as operations constitute over half of TriMet’s budget.

4. Methodology

Given the lack of detail provided by local jurisdictions about the projects they are submitting –and no information on how they relate to the region’s adopted RTP goals – it is impossible to fully assess the project list. In doing our analysis, we the project list in three ways:

1. We reviewed the most expensive projects and other projects we believed might either expand non-auto transportation choices or lead to negative impacts. We chose a subset of projects for further review rather than the entire list due to the limited information available and the resources that would be required to fully review the more than 1,000 projects submitted for the RTP.

2. We explored the level of investment in car-focused road building versus expanding transportation choice. To this end, we outlined the number of and percent of funding for road building, bicycle/ pedestrian, management, and transit capital projects.

In reviewing projects, we were cognizant that many projects mention improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network but are primarily road projects that also include minimal or legally required bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian elements in descriptions may indicate merely that mentioning alternative modes in a project is likely to be viewed favorably although the actual investment may be incidental to the overall scale of the project.

3. We tapped the wisdom and expertise of people throughout the region who have in-depth knowledge about specific projects, transportation planning in our region, and their respective communities. We asked them to provide their perspective on how well the project lists support the 2035 RTP goals, and got their take on the projects they know well.

Our evaluation of projects is not exhaustive. Many projects, both excellent and concerning, were not included in our analysis, and we hope that our start will lead to further analysis.

5. Local Project Evaluation List

Washington County

Total Projects – 85

Total Cost - \$1.6 Billion



- Adds 40,000 feet of sidewalks in station communities and a regional center, improving the environment for walking and decreasing the need to drive to essential destinations.
- Includes projects that improve road connectivity, making the existing road network work better without expanding it. For example, the 173rd/174th Undercrossing Improvement (\$58.6 million, Project # 10547) from Cornell Rd to Bronson Rd would create a three-lane under crossing of Highway-26 with bike lanes and sidewalks. Although this project is expensive, it improves connections that are currently cut off by the existing highways. However, Washington County does not have this project planned for construction until 2018-2025.
- Pilots an innovative active transport project, the Aloha Bike Blvd Active Transportation Project (\$16 million, #11239). Part of a Metro program to double bicycle commuting in the region in the next ten years, the trail and bike boulevard improvements would extend from the Westside Trail to Brookwood Avenue along collector and local streets throughout the Aloha area. This project is an example of how less costly pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements can be integrated into the regional transportation system.



- Includes many road widening projects that conflict with regional goals. Projects that exemplify this strategy include the Scholls Ferry Rd Expansion (\$19.7 million, #10596) which would widen Scholls Ferry Rd from Hwy 217 to 121st Avenue to 7 lanes, and the Walker Rd Expansion (\$76 million, #10569 plus 3 new projects not yet assigned an ID), a road widening project to five lanes (up from 2 lanes) along Walker Road, from NW Amberglen Parkway to Highway 217 between Beaverton and Hillsboro. This 5-mile project, listed as four separate segments, costs roughly \$15.2 million per mile.
- Expands roads at or near the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), which encourages expensive, low-density sprawl development. These road expansions work against the region's land use goals, as they encourage development on the edge of the region², creating pressure to expand the UGB.
- Proposes increasing Urban Reserves by 34,000 acres, leading to low density sprawl development over farm land, increasing commute times, global warming pollution, and leaving less funding to maintain the infrastructure we already have.
- Budgets only 3.5% of its \$1.6 Billion budget for projects primarily focused on bike and pedestrian improvements.
- Uses potentially marginal bike and pedestrian improvements to “dress up” large-scale road building. Although seventy-eight percent of

² Litman, Todd “Generated Traffic and Induced Travel,” Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 2009. <<http://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf>>

its projects reference bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements, a more detailed analysis of these projects demonstrates that it ties bike and pedestrian improvements to road widening projects, which generally negatively impact biking and walking environments. (see table 1). Over three quarters of the projects mentioning bicycles and pedestrian facilities are road widening projects that will increase capacity for auto travel.

Washington County Projects That Include Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

<i>Project Type</i>	<i>Number</i>
Road Widening with Bike/Ped	
Widen to 3 Lanes	19
Widen to 4 Lanes	1
Widen to 5 Lanes	22
Widen to 7 Lanes	1
Not Specified	2
Total	45
Road Extension with Bike/Ped	5
Primarily or Exclusively Bike and/or Pedestrian Infrastructure	
Complete gap in bike or pedestrian connection	13
Improve regional trail connectivity	3
Total	16
Total	66

Hillsboro

Total Projects - 86

Total Cost - \$307 million



• Submitted several projects that improve access to transit, but unfortunately, the majority of them will not begin until at least 2018-2025. Of these projects, the ones that focus on existing centers rather than development of future regional and transportation centers should be prioritized for more near-term construction.



• General approach to congestion, reliability, and safety issues relies on increased capacity for auto-travel, especially in future regional and town centers.

• Proposes a number of road expansion projects, including projects that extend to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). As was discussed with reference to Washington County’s list, this strategy creates undesirable pressure to expand the UGB.

• The 185th Ave Expansion (\$10 million, #10835) is a half mile, 7-lane road expansion project that may undermine the success of one of its transit-oriented development projects. When considered with Washington County’s 5-lane expansion project along Walker Rd, this project will have lasting land use, environmental and health impacts for the surrounding communities. Expanding these intersecting roads to 5- and 7-lanes effectively severs the surrounding communities of Tanasbourne,

Triple Creek, and Sommerset West-Elmonica South.

With Orenco Station, one of the region's most well known Transit Oriented Developments, less than three miles to the west and the Willow Creek/Southwest 18th Avenue Transit Center 1.2 miles away, a large road expansion fails to meet the needs of this area. 185th Ave. south of Walker Rd is 5-lanes, with mixed residential and employment areas. It is unlikely that this project will provide long-term congestion relief, as the existing bottleneck will likely move further south. It is also unclear how a 7 lane road could possibly serve the land use needs at the 185th Avenue town center.

- Proposes the Tualatin Valley Highway Expansion (\$42 million, #10846) project, which would widen 2.5-miles of SW Tualatin Valley Highway from SW 196th Ave to SW Brookwood Avenue. This project is one of the 50 most expensive projects in the region (42 out of 50) and costs 13.7% of Hillsboro's total project list.

Although this project does not list the number of lanes to be added, it appears to expand the road to 7-lanes. It is categorized as capacity expansion on what is currently 5-lanes, and previous iterations of the project list identified it as a 7-lane road expansion project. This new and vague project description appears to mask an expansion to 7 lanes. It is unlikely that a 7-lane road will either support the RTP goals or its purported purpose of congestion relief. While this project appears later in the 2035 time horizon (estimated construction between 2026-2035), it in effect ties up over 1/7 of Hillsboro's total RTP budget, money that could be spent on supporting much less expensive

projects that improve street connections or access to transit, or build out the bike and pedestrian system.

Tualatin

Total Projects - 36 projects

Total Cost - \$472 Million



- Proposes the 124th Ave Construction (\$82.5 million, #10736), an expensive new roadway project that does not appear to support regional needs. This 5-lane road project from SW Tonquin Rd to SW Tualatin-Sherwood Rd is intended to improve freight mobility and economic development within the area. However, it appears to be an over-sized facility in an undeveloped area, with no connections to nearby communities.

Clackamas County

Total Projects - 50 projects

Total Cost - \$1.1 Billion



- List appears to focus investments in projects that improve streetscapes and access to transportation choices in already-developed neighborhoods, town centers, and employment/industrial areas.
- For example, proposes the West Sunnybrook Road Extension (10019), which will provide

an alternative east/west route to Sunnyside Road within the Clackamas Regional Center and address the needs of Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT), Clackamas Community College, and the Aquatic Park, which are all located at the intersection of SE Harmony Rd and SE 82nd Drive.

Interconnected road networks relieve local traffic from arterial streets and provides safe and convenient connections for bicyclists and pedestrians to public transit, schools and other local destinations. Although we are skeptical of most road building, this project increases road connectivity in an area where current infrastructure will not meet the future site development and expansion plans at OIT.

The initial plan called for a widening of Sunnyside Rd to 5 lanes in addition to the Sunnybrook Road Extension. This expansion would have negatively impacted an already difficult pedestrian environment at the intersection of SE Sunnyside Rd and SE 82nd Drive and removed a grove of mature native Oregon white oak. Clackamas County provided an alternative to this oversized plan, improving the connections within the existing street network while also avoiding unnecessary environmental damage.



- Phases the Sunrise Corridor, a major new freeway project that has been the subject of debate and study for decades. Instead of building a limited access freeway, Clackamas County proposes several local projects that

address specific needs. Several smaller scale projects currently moving forward to address freight mobility and bottlenecks in the Clackamas Industrial Area (roughly SE 130th to I-205 between Highway 212 and SE Lawnfield Rd) are much less expensive and potentially without the negative impacts of the original plan.

While Phase I represents a marked improvement over construction of a new, limited access freeway, these projects still constitute a set of expensive road capacity expansions, and later phases include plans for a new freeway, at a total project cost of over \$1 Billion. See ODOT, page 18, for more information.



- Over 80% of Clackamas County's budget is spent on road expansions, including over 60% for projects that widen roads to add vehicle lanes. Six of the county's road widening projects do not specify the number of lanes to be added, severely limiting the ability to assess the impact of the road widening.
- Only 12 % of the total proposed projects primarily serve bicycles and pedestrians.

Milwaukie

Total Projects - 18 projects

Total Cost - \$107 Million



- Invests heavily in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Over 60% of Milwaukie’s project list supports bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, including significant investments that improve access to Milwaukie Town Center and planned light rail stations. For example, the Downtown Station Area Streetscaping (\$6.7 Million, #10100), planned for near-term development, adds lighting for pedestrian, street trees, rain gardens, and ADA ramps.
- Roadway investments focus on improving street function rather than expanding roads. Of its three road projects, the only one planned for the near term addresses gaps in the bicycle system, and of the other two, one addresses conflicts between rail and vehicle traffic and the other improves both pedestrian and vehicle flow at an intersection.


Happy Valley

Total Projects - 11 projects

Total Cost - \$169 Million




- Proposes new roads that increase connectivity within the Happy Valley Town Center. Neighborhoods with a regular network of local roads are an important component of livable communities. This street fabric is particularly important for emerging communities such as Happy Valley. However, in light of the lack of projects in Happy Valley serving multiple modes (see thumbs down, below), Happy Valley does not appear to be creating a system that supports transit or an integrated network of bicycle and pedestrian connections to these new roads.





- Uses 100% of its funds to increase road capacity for vehicles. Transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure except on road widening projects and new roads are completely absent from Happy Valley’s list. To address transportation needs of all communities and reduce the need to drive to all destinations, Happy Valley should support an integrated transit, bicycle and pedestrian network.



Multnomah County

Total Projects – 45

Total Cost - \$439 Million



- Includes a project to explicitly integrate housing, transportation, and land use investment strategies. Multnomah County’s list includes a project to Locate Efficient Living strategies (\$450,000, #11293). While this is a small investment and there is limited detail in what these programs and strategies are and who will be served by them (e.g. low-income, seniors, people of color, people with disabilities), Multnomah County is the only jurisdiction that has dedicated transportation funding to this type of integrated housing, land use and transportation project.

- Includes two major trail projects: The 40 Mile Loop Trail (\$3.5 Million, #10408), slated for near-term construction, addresses the gaps in the 40-Mile Loop Trail within the Columbia Cascade River District. The Beaver Creek Trail (\$1.4 Million, #10409) project would provide multi-modal access to Mt. Hood Community College. Together these projects are a bargain, totaling just over 1% of Multnomah County’s budget.



- Due to Multnomah County’s responsibility for Willamette River bridges, a small number of projects account for almost half of Multnomah county’s anticipated costs. These bridges provide essential connection between east and west in

our region, but the steep costs of maintaining the bridges limits the County's ability to invest in other projects.

- While a good project, the Beaver Creek Trail (\$ 1.4 million, #10409) is not slated until 2018-2025, and should be moved forward in the County's timeline. Low-cost multi-modal investments that serve underserved communities should be prioritized by Multnomah County, especially given the current lack of multi-modal infrastructure and the rising rates of poverty within East County.

City of Portland

Total Projects - 193 projects

Total Cost - \$1.57 Billion



- Proposes many bicycle and pedestrian investments and other projects that reduce driving. One hundred of Portland's 193 projects include pedestrian and bicycle improvements; 76 are dedicated entirely to improving pedestrian and bicycle street connections and regional systems.
- Is the only jurisdiction that explicitly addresses pedestrian infrastructure improvements around elementary schools. (School Access Safety Improvements (\$500,000, #11127).
- Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements include projects supporting industrial areas. Lombard Overcrossing at Columbia Slough N. (\$9.8 Million , #10217) and Swan Island Active Transportation

and Mobility Improvements (\$9 Million, #11197) will both improve connections in industrial areas, increasing freight mobility by reducing single occupancy vehicle trips. Both projects improve pedestrian and bicycle access to industrial and employment areas are anticipated to be built in near-term.

The Lombard Overcrossing will add sidewalk and bike lanes to the recently strengthened bridge in an area that has a number of multi-modal deficiencies and gaps. The Swan Island Active Transportation project will improve access and mobility on Swan Island by constructing and improving the bike/pedestrian network in the next several years. It will be integrated into the surrounding communities via the Willamette Greenway Trail and its connecting paths (Waud Bluff Trail, Going to the River) and improve connections to public transit.



- Allocates one third of its project budget (33.9%) to streetcar, which increases transportation options and supports walkable neighborhoods by fostering concentrated development, decreasing people's need to drive. However, it primarily serves the central city, limiting dollars available for other projects in less well served communities. Portland should make street car investments in both outer and inner areas of Portland, ensuring new lines benefit historically disadvantaged communities, in particular the underserved areas of East Portland.

• Includes projects benefiting historically underserved, low-income neighborhoods in East Portland, but does not prioritize them for construction in the next several years. These projects address key pedestrian safety and access issues to regional employment and industrial areas, as well as key network gaps that address physical barriers (e.g. pedestrian highway overcrossings). See Table below.

A selection of bike, pedestrian and transit projects in Portland east of I-205 slated for 2018 or later			
Metro ID	Project	Description	Cost
10223	SE 122nd (at Morrison): Pedestrian Overcrossing	Provide an at-grade improved pedestrian crossing on SE 122nd Ave	\$1,993,000
10225	SE 122nd Ave. (Harold to Raymond): Powellhurst/Gilbert Pedestrian Improvements	Add sidewalks to SE 122nd Ave. between SE Harold Street and SE Raymond Street	\$2,358,000
10203	NE Glisan St (122nd - City Limits): Multi-modal Improvements	Infill missing sidewalk, add curb ramps at corner, add 3 median island crossings, and add a signal	\$3,100,241
10198	NE/SE 122nd (NE Airport Way to SE Powell Blvd): ITS	Install needed ITS infrastructure (communication network, new traffic controllers, CCTV cameras, and vehicle/ pedestrian detectors). These ITS devices allow us to provide more efficient and safe operation of our traffic signal system	\$515,703
10199	SE 136th Ave. (Division to Foster) Bikeway	From SE Division Street to SE Powell Boulevard: Improve to 36' curb-to-curb with 2-13' traffic lanes and 2-5' bike lanes; 6" curbs, 9' swales and 6' sidewalks on both sides	\$6,090,590
		Total	\$14,057,534



• Continues to include the West Hayden Island Crossing (\$99.3 Million, #10343), a new, four lane bridge to serve a huge industrial area proposed on the largest unprotected wildlife habitat in the Portland region. The Portland City Council removed all language from the East Hayden Island Plan that presumed a West Hayden Island bridge, and a City of Portland task force is presently evaluating whether development and natural resource protection on West Hayden Island are incompatible. This project should be removed from the RTP list until this work is completed and a decision has been made regarding the desirability of creating a marine industrial complex on West Hayden Island. See Port of Portland, page 16, for more information.

Port of Portland

Total Projects – 26

Total Cost - \$373 Million



- Addresses railway noise in residential neighborhoods of the St. Johns Cathedral Park area. The Cathedral Park Quiet Zone (\$8.2 million, #10375) addresses the rail switching noise related to the Toyota operations at Terminal 4 by improving multiple public rail crossings. This terminal is adjacent to St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods, including both single and multi-family residential areas. Juxtapositions of industrial and residential land uses create a number of noise conflicts in the community. In maintaining the functionality of the industrial and employment area while also addressing the livability of these neighborhoods, this project recognizes the important relationship between transportation and land use systems.



- Proposes the Transportation Demand Management project (#10380) to reduce driving through a variety of trip-reduction programs in the airport area, but allocates no funding to support it.



- Proposes a new 4-lane bridge to West Hayden Island (\$99.3 Million, #10343), one of the largest unprotected habitats left in the metro area. The Port of Portland has not justified destroying the ecological value of West Hayden Island and expending almost \$100 Million in bridge construction costs alone to build a marine industrial facility. Protecting West Hayden Island as a natural area would create outstanding recreational opportunities to enjoy nature in North Portland, leading to one of the region's premier natural areas. See Portland, page 15, for more information.
- Proposes two very expensive projects that raise serious concerns about whether other solutions could better address regional needs: a \$92 Million grade separation at 82nd Ave and Airport Way and a \$59 Million project to construct braided ramps between the I-205 interchange and Mt. Hood interchange.

TriMet

Total Projects – 25

Total Cost - \$ 2.85 Billion



- As the region's public transit provider, TriMet goes a long way in helping shift the balance in our transportation system. TriMet's project list

supports number of integrated transportation systems that serve regional and town centers and neighborhoods, and includes significant investments to protect the investments the region has already made.

- With the exception of the past year, ridership has increased steadily over the last 20 years, reflecting TriMet's success in expanding convenient transportation choices.
- Although not obvious on its RTP project list, TriMet has implemented multiple practices that support Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and expand opportunity for minority and women-owned firms and workers in construction contracts. TriMet's commitment to supporting a strong and diverse workforce benefits our region and is a key aspect of ensuring equity in regional planning efforts.



- Although TriMet has cut service during the recession over the past several months (see thumbs down, below), it utilized money saving strategies including an 8% expense cut to reduce the impact of the funding reduction and cuts have been small compared to other metropolitan areas.
- While light rail is an important part of our transit system – it increases transportation choices, fosters development in areas well-served by transit, and brings funds to the region – TriMet's aggressive focus on light rail leads to tradeoffs that result in diminished bus service. Maintaining and improving bus service is essential to an integrated transit network and serves many communities not served by light rail. (See also

thumbs down, below).

- It is unclear whether all new light rail alignments will lead to positive development patterns, one of the primary advantages of rail. Multiple lines built so far, including the new Green Line along I-205, have been placed next to freeways. Although it is significantly cheaper to build where right of way already exists and building next to freeways avoids many community impacts, it also leads to rail lines where development is undesirable due to poor air quality and noise.
- While TriMet serves destinations across the region, it appears to fall short of achieving high quality service to multiple destinations within the region. Expanding the focus of service to a greater extent beyond downtown Portland would help bring our transit system to a higher level.



- TriMet's policies do not support maintaining adequate operating dollars for bus service.
 - o TriMet's practice of using operating dollars to support capital projects decreases the amount available for operations. Bus service is funded primarily from operating dollars, and the recent cuts on bus lines and bus service during the current budget shortfalls demonstrate the problems with inadequate bus operating funding.
 - o Funding cuts affect buses more deeply than light rail. TriMet should implement a policy regarding how operating dollars, including payroll tax increases, are allocated between bus service and light rail.

- Proposes increases in park and ride capacity around the region (\$20 Million, #10988). These funds would be better used for TOD, bus stop access including shelters and sidewalks, or other strategies that minimize the need to drive. Park and Ride lots do not contribute enough to ridership to justify their cost, and TriMet has successfully fostered strong transit usage with fewer park and ride spaces than other regions.

Oregon Department of Transportation

Total Projects – 34

Total Cost - \$ 4.54 Billion (\$1.56 Billion excluding Columbia River Crossing)



- The Sunrise Corridor plan was to build a new limited access freeway onto I-205 to attempt to address congestion and to serve industrial uses and the anticipated growth in the Damascus Town Center. Instead, the project has been phased, with a \$130 million total cost for Phase I, roughly one tenth of the total \$1.3-1.6 billion project estimate. It remains to be seen whether the road expansions in Phase I will address the congestion issues or succumb to the issues common to increased capacity. We are also very concerned about the size, impacts, and cost of later phases of this project. See Clackamas County, page 10, for more information.

- ODOT faces at least two key challenges in improving its project list:

1. ODOT does not have sufficient multi-modal funding for bicycle or pedestrian improvements on its facilities. While these

types of facilities may not be realistic strategies on major freeways, urban highways within ODOT’s jurisdiction could support and benefit from a systematic integration into surrounding neighborhoods and alternative transportation systems.

2. As a result of the legislative earmarking in the Jobs and Transportation Act (2009), ODOT was required to allocate a significant portion of its budget to five “modernization” projects, leaving ODOT with more limited discretion to include road preservation and bridge projects. Not including the Columbia River Crossing, almost 9% of ODOT’s RTP budget (\$139 million) are legislative earmarks. An example of one such project is the expensive interchange on US Highway 26 at Shute Rd (\$45 Million, #11178), which is not among the region’s greatest needs.



- ODOT’s project list reflects a continued freeway expansion approach to transportation. ODOT’s approach to addressing freeway issues based on an increased capacity model is problematic. This strategy increases driving, does not support an integrated, multi-modal regional transportation system, and disregards the land use and community development impacts that highway expansions have on neighboring communities.

- Pushes the multi-billion dollar Columbia River Crossing (\$2.98 Billion for roadway, #10893) project, a massive freeway bridge/interchange rebuilding effort. This project would increase driving, exacerbate the climate crisis, and worsen air quality in neighborhoods near I-5

and I-205. The financial cost of this project is so high it diverts a massive amount of our limited transportation resources with huge negative impacts and without providing benefits that come close to its cost.

- The Columbia River Crossing would also exacerbate current bottlenecks at the junction of I-5 and I-405 and I-5 at the Rose Quarter, forcing the consideration of additional freeway expansions in the heart of Portland. In fact, ODOT has proposed \$116 million in funding for I-5 at the Rose Quarter/Lloyd District (\$86 Million for construction plus \$30 Million for right of way, #11176 and 10867), which likely involves expanding the freeway.
- ODOT has also proposed other large and expensive freeway projects, including freeway widening on OR 217 (\$37.7 Million, #11122) as well as a massive project on I-5 south of Portland (\$220 Million, #11304), which may also be a freeway expansion.
- Abdicates its responsibility for urban highways, hampering opportunities to create streets with bicycle and pedestrian facilities suitable for mixed use development along corridors, which is key to achieving land use goals. While ODOT's limited funding may make it impossible to fully address the issues on all of its facilities, its focus on expensive freeway expansions and its decision to force local jurisdictions to take them – or to leave them unaddressed – is not a responsible solution to this issue. Examples of these “orphan highways” include Highway 26 (Powell Blvd) through Portland and Gresham and McLoughlin Blvd. through Portland and areas of Clackamas County.