



Metro | Agenda ***Please note early start time**

Meeting: Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)
Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009
Time: **4 to 7 p.m.***
Place: Council Chambers

- | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 PM | 1. | <u>CALL TO ORDER</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| 4:02 PM | 2. | <u>SELF INTRODUCTIONS & COMMUNICATIONS</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| 4:05 PM | 3. | <u>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</u> | |
| 4:10 PM | 4. | <u>CONSENT AGENDA</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| | | * Consideration of the MPAC Retreat Minutes for October 23, 2009 | |
| | | * Consideration of the MPAC Minutes for October 28, 2009 | |
| 4:15 PM | 5. | <u>COUNCIL UPDATE</u> | |
| | 6. | <u>ACTION ITEMS</u> | |
| 4:20 PM | 6.1 | * Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, with the Following Elements for Final Review and Analysis for Air Quality Conformance: The Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan; The Regional Freight Plan; The High Capacity Transit System Plan; and The Regional Transportation Functional Plan – <u>ACTION REQUESTED</u> | Kim Ellis |
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exhibit F (Discussion items)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greenhouse gas emissions and RTP Climate Action Plan• RTP Performance targets and application of RTP policies and targets in local plans and local, regional and state investment priorities• Alternative mobility standards• Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities• I-5/99W Connector Study Recommendations• Exhibit G (Consent items for consideration as a package)
<i>MPAC members may raise consent items for discussion.</i>• Amendments proposed by JPACT and MPAC members
<i>These amendments will be considered as part of Exhibit G unless already identified as a Discussion item under Exhibit F. MPAC members may raise individual amendments for discussion.</i> | |

6:20 PM 6.2 * Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Accepting the Population and Employment Forecasts and the Urban Growth Report As Support for Determination of Capacity of the Urban Growth Boundary – ACTION REQUESTED
Does MPAC recommend that the Metro Council approve the resolution?

**Malu Wilkinson
Ted Reid**

Urban Growth Report (UGR) and Regional Forecast:

- 2030 population and employment forecast as recommended by the Chief Operating Officer
- UGR's assessment of residential demand and capacity as recommended by the Chief Operating Officer
- UGR's assessment of general, non-industrial demand and capacity as recommended by the Chief Operating Officer
- UGR's assessment of general, industrial demand and capacity as recommended by the Chief Operating Officer
- UGR's assessment of large lot employment demand and capacity as recommended by the Chief Operating Officer or does MPAC recommend amending the UGR's assessment of large employment lot need from a range of 200-800 acres to a range of 200-1,500 acres?

Resolution

- Does MPAC recommend amending the resolution accepting the UGR and forecast to explicitly mention the housing needs analysis as proposed by the City of Portland at the October 28, 2009 MPAC meeting?

6:50 PM 7. **MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

7 PM 8. **ADJOURN**

Shane Bemis, Vice Chair

* Material available electronically.

Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available 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.



2009 MPAC Tentative Agendas

Tentative as of November 9, 2009

<p><u>MPAC Meeting</u> November 18, 2009, 4 to 7 p.m. (Note: special meeting date and time)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making the Greatest Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make recommendation to Metro Council on Resolution 09-xxxx approving 2035 RTP pending air quality conformity analysis and findings including any proposed amendments from MPAC or JPACT (action) • Make recommendation to Metro Council on Resolution 09-xxxx, accepting regional range forecast and urban growth report (action) 	<p><u>(Due to holidays, only one November and one December MPAC meeting is currently scheduled)</u></p>
<p><u>MPAC Meeting</u> December 9, 2009, 5 to 7 p.m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of the Core 4 Reserves recommendation – Information • Nomination of 2010 MPAC officers 	<p><u>(Due to holidays, only one November and one December MPAC meeting is currently scheduled)</u></p>
<p><u>January – March 2010 (1st quarter)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election of 2010 MPAC officers • MPAC makes recommendation to the Metro Council on Resolution No. 09-xxxx authorizing an Intergovernmental Agreement with counties to designate Urban and Rural Reserves • MPAC discusses and recommends to the Metro Council resolution on performance measures • Metro Council proposes Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) amendments that designate urban reserves • Local governments propose local efficiency measures that can be counted towards closing capacity gap • MPAC discusses Ordinance 10-xxxx, which 1) designates urban reserves to accommodate long-range population and employment growth, 2) amends the Regional Framework Plan to include urban and rural reserves policies, 3) amends UGMFP to implement regional policies on urban and rural reserves, and 4) adopts a map that shows the location of urban and rural reserves. • Investment Strategy 	<p><u>April – June 2010 (2nd quarter)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPAC discusses and recommends Ordinance 10-xxxx, which 1) designates urban reserves to accommodate long-range population and employment growth, 2) amends the Regional Framework Plan to include urban and rural reserves policies, 3) amends UGMFP to implement regional policies on urban and rural reserves, and 4) adopts a map that shows the location of urban and rural reserves. • Metro Council holds public hearings and adopts Ordinance 10-xxxx which 1) designates urban reserves to accommodate long-range population and employment growth, 2) amends the Regional Framework Plan to include urban and rural reserves policies, 3) amends UGMFP to implement regional policies on urban and rural reserves, and 4) adopts a map that shows the location of urban and rural reserves. <i>Adoption of this ordinance by the Metro Council constitutes a land use action appealable to LUBA</i> • Counties adopt land use ordinances and designate rural reserves

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public opinion research • Developing Centers and Corridors (Expert Advisory Group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local governments adopt local efficiency measures that can be counted towards closing capacity gap • MPAC and JPACT discuss and make recommendation to Metro Council on Ordinance 10-xxxx, adopting final 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, including Transportation Functional Plan amendments and Regional Framework Plan policies • Metro Council holds public hearings and adopts Ordinance 10-xxxx, adopting final 2035 Regional Transportation Plan including transportation functional plan amendments and Regional Framework Plan policies. <i>Adoption of this ordinance by the Metro Council constitutes a land use action appealable to LUBA</i>
<p><u>July – September 2010 (3rd quarter)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPAC (and JPACT?) discusses Ordinance 10-xxxx, amending the Regional Framework Plan and the UGMFP to adopt strategies and actions to close the gap between the 20-year need and existing capacity 	<p><u>October – December 2010 (4th quarter)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPAC (and JPACT?) discusses and recommends to the Metro Council Ordinance 10-xxxx, amending the Regional Framework Plan and the UGMFP to adopt strategies and actions to close the gap between the 20-year need and existing capacity • Metro Council holds public hearings and adopts Ordinance 10-xxxx, amending the Regional Framework Plan and the UGMFP to adopt strategies and actions to close the gap between the 20-year need and existing capacity • If necessary, MPAC (and JPACT?) consider ordinance recommending to Metro Council Urban Growth Boundary capacity adjustments • If necessary, Metro Council considers ordinance for Urban Growth Boundary capacity adjustments. <i>Adoption of this ordinance by the Metro Council constitutes a land use action appealable to LUBA</i>



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 23, 2009

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Shane Bemis, Vice Chair
Charlotte Lehan, Second Vice Chair
Sam Adams
Matt Berkow
Jody Carson
Nathalie Darcy
Dennis Doyle
Amanda Fritz
Jack Hoffman
Carl Hosticka
Dick Jones
Robert Liberty
Rod Park
Alice Norris
Judy Shiprack
Rick VanBeveren
Mike Weatherby
Jerry Willey
Richard Whitman

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
Clackamas Co. Commission
City of Portland
Multnomah Co. Citizen
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Washington Co. Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Portland
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
Metro Council
Clackamas Co. Special Districts
Metro Council
Metro Council
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Multnomah Co. Commission
TriMet Board of Directors
City of Fairview, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Tom Brian, Chair
Ken Allen
Richard Burke
Pat Campbell
Robert Kindel
Wilda Parks
Steve Stuart
Dilafruz Williams

AFFILIATION

Washington Co. Commission
Port of Portland
Washington Co. Special Districts
City of Vancouver
City of North Plains, City in Washington Co. outside UGB
Clackamas Co. Citizen
Clark Co., Washington Commission
Governing Body of School Districts

STAFF:

Dick Benner, Rex Burkholder, Carlotta Collette, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Kathryn Harrington, Milena Hermansky Mike Hoglund, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Sherry Oeser, Ken Ray, Deborah Redman, Ted Reid, Andy Shaw, Randy Tucker, Malu Wilkinson.

1. WELCOME

Vice Chair Shane Bemis declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 8:20 a.m.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

Committee members introduced themselves.

3. AGENDA OVERVIEW

Mr. Andy Cotugno of Metro provided an overview of the agenda. Staff requested input from members on the draft Urban Growth Report (UGR) and draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); specifically areas of consensus within both draft plans. Where consensus lacks, the committee will discuss specific changes to be made. The deadline for MPAC to propose amendments to the UGR and RTP is Wednesday, October 28th. The committee is scheduled to take action on both reports at their November 18th meeting.

Additionally, due to the lively discussion on Performance Measures at the October 14th MPAC meeting, adoption will be postponed to January 2010.

4. URBAN GROWTH REPORT (RESIDENTIAL)

Mr. Dick Benner of Metro briefed the committee on various components of the UGR, RTP, and Urban and Rural Reserves (URR) decisions and outlined further actions that will be laid out next year. (See attachment A for details.)

Ms. Malu Wilkinson of Metro provided an overview of the different components of the UGR. The UGR is a technical analysis of the region's 20-year population and employment growth and the capacity of the land inside the current Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to meet that forecasted growth. By the end of 2009, the Council must define the gap between demand and supply. In 2010, discussions will focus on how to fill that gap, either by increasing efficiency within the existing UGB or by expanding the boundary.

Ms. Wilkinson presented a brief overview of technical assumptions used in preparing the UGR and answered questions from the committee. Topics discussed include:

- Refill-rate maps
- "Refill" versus "infill"
- Historical data used in the forecast
- Geographical range of data
- Zoning laws
- Market conditions, investment, and subsidy
- Accountability

Additionally, Mr. Richard Whitman of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development and Mr. Benner provided information on the legal requirements related to the Council's acceptance of the UGR.

The committee agreed that the residential analysis in the Urban Growth Report is sound.

5. BREAK

Committee members briefly recessed for a break.

6. URBAN GROWTH REPORT (EMPLOYMENT)

Ms. Wilkinson directed the committee's attention to the preliminary summary of comments received on the draft employment analysis. Comments fell into three main areas: Forecast, large-lot industrial land, and capacity. Ms. Wilkinson explained that there are three main components of the employment analysis in the UGR: Non-industrial, general industrial, and large-lots industrial.

Mr. Eric Hovee of E.D. Hovee Consulting briefed the committee on the regional employment forecast that informs the UGR. Items he discussed:

- Forecasted growth rates are above the national average
- Manufacturing jobs are expected to increase in number
- Non-manufacturing jobs are expected to grow more than manufacturing jobs
- Employment clusters
- Effects of the recession on companies' activities
- Risks associated with over- or under-estimating employment growth

Committee discussion on Mr. Hovee's presentation included:

- Difficulties associated with moving manufacturing firms to new geographical locations;
- Assumptions used when defining industrial infill;
- The history of what has happened with large-lots that were brought in with recent UGB expansions;
- Wages paid by large-lot employers;
- Ability of neighboring large-lots to consolidate with into larger lots; and
- Infrastructure challenges.

Ms. Wilkinson then summarized technical assumptions used in determining the demand for and supply of employment land, and explained staff conclusions about the need for general industrial land, non-industrial land, and large-lot land. The committee agreed that the UGR provides a sound analysis indicating that there is a 1,000-acre gap at the high end of the demand forecast for non-industrial employment uses.

Mayor Jerry Willey of Hillsboro was concerned that the range for large lot industrial land was too limited and recommended that it should be widened to 200 to 1,500, versus 800 acre parcels, as originally proposed. He cited unemployment rates and new industries as reasoning.

The committee discussed:

- Difficulties involved with trying to assemble large-parcel lots.
- The role of Damascus as it compares with the rest of the region.
- Analyzing from the regional-level versus focusing on counties or smaller jurisdictions.
- The importance of being "shovel-ready."
- Risks and benefits of acting conservatively with respect to large-lot reservation.
- Concept of "regional equity."

Overall, the committee generally agreed on: The importance of availability of land to match, as closely as possible, market demand; the fact that land determined to be "shovel-ready" is more marketable to outside prospective employers; and the importance of having accurate facts upon which to base decisions. The committee did not come to an agreement on whether the UGR presents a sound analysis of large lot needs.

Next Steps

The MPAC Employment Subcommittee is charged with identifying approaches to meet large lot needs while implementing the 2040 regional vision. The Subcommittee's first meeting is scheduled for October 28th.

7. LUNCH

The committee recessed for lunch.

8. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is scheduled for approval by resolution at the November 18 2009 MPAC meeting and adoption by ordinance in June 2010.

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro provided background on the RTP. 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.

Last summer, MPAC and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) identified projects to include in the draft plan. Staff evaluated the projects to assess how well the recommended projects performed relative to the performance targets endorsed by JPACT. Preliminary results from the transportation model analysis show the draft RTP does not meet many of the targets including the state targets for reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Ms. Ellis stressed that transportation investments must be combined with land-use and other policy tools to achieve desired goals.

Committee discussion included:

- Cost of fuel assumed in the models;
- Potential for greenhouse gas emissions reductions with pricing mechanisms and other policy instruments;
- Consumer marketing and education; and
- Modeling capabilities of MetroScope.

Mr. Mike Hoglund of Metro briefed the committee on the planned timeline for meeting state and regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets as mandated by House Bill 2001. HB 2001 requires Metro to "develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios" designed to reduce GHG emissions by January 2012, and Metro to select one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment. Metro will incorporate recommendations from this effort in the next RTP update in 2014.

Discussion item #1: Work plan to address GHG emission reduction.

Staff recommends that Metro lead and effort in coordination with local, regional and state partners. A timeline for further action is also recommended. The committee agreed to accept staff recommendations with no further changes.

Discussion item #2: RTP performance targets.

JPACT endorsed a list of draft performance targets. Staff recommends that adoption of the RTP include these targets. The committee suggested the following refinements:

Safety – By 2035, reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities by 50 percent compared to 2005.

Freight reliability – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per truck by 10 percent compared to 2005.

Climate change – By 2035, reduce transportation-related carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.

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

Affordability – By 2035, reduce 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 compared to 2000.

Access to daily needs – By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by trails, bicycling and public transit or within 15 minutes by sidewalks for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations compared to 2005.

MPAC also discussed the need to explore how the regional-level performance targets could be applied to projects to ensure state, local and regional investment priorities implement the new RTP policies, particularly the greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. The discussion identified three areas 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.

Discussion item #3: State approval of alternative mobility standards

Staff recommends that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Metro staff lead the effort to define alternative mobility standards in coordination with local and regional partners. A timeline for further action is also recommended. The committee agreed to accept staff recommendations with no further changes.

Discussion item #4: Input on corridor refinement policies.

Ms. Deborah Redman of Metro briefed committee members on the Corridor Refinement Plan (CRP) prioritization factors and requested input on factors that will help compare and prioritize the relative urgency of planning for future transportation solutions for five mobility corridors. The committee agreed to accept staff recommendations on the technical factors with no further changes.

9. ADJOURN

Seeing no further business, Second Vice Chair Charlotte Lehan adjourned the retreat at 2:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Milena B. Hermansky
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR OCTOBER 23, 2009:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
	Document	10/23/2009	Updated MPAC retreat agenda	102309j-01
	Packet	10/23/2009	Draft UGR MPAC retreat discussion materials	102309j-02
	Chart	10/20/2009	Preliminary summary of comments on draft employment analysis	102309j-03
	Packet	10/23/2009	Appendix 7: Portland metropolitan area housing choice forecasts; subarea profiles	102309j-04
	Packet - charts	10/20/2009	Supplemental materials on draft RTP	102309j-05
	Letter	10/20/2009	City of Tualatin comments re: Making the Greatest Place COO Recommendation	102309j-06
	Letter	10/15/2009	Port of Portland recommendations re: Making the Greatest Place COO Recommendation	102309j-07

UGR Resolution:

- Accepts the population and employment forecasts
- Accepts the UGR

Reserves IGAs:

Required:

- Map of proposed reserves
- Proposed policies for Comprehensive Plans and Regional Framework Plan
- Proposed Planning Period (a number of years between 40 and 50)

Optional:

- Agreement on collaborative process for concept planning
- Agreement on process for minor revisions to UR/undesigned boundaries

Urban/Rural Reserves Ordinance:

- New Regional Framework Plan Policy
- Map of Reserves
- Changes to Urban Growth Management Function Plan (e.g. Title 11, "concept plans")

Concept Plans:

- New Regional Framework Plan Policy (plan before land is added to UGB)
- Designate land use (industrial, center, etc.)
- Current Title 11 elements (street plan, school plan, etc.)
- Urban serves agreements
- Annexation agreements

Regional Transportation Plan Resolution:

- Accepts new RTP policies and projects
- Accepts draft TSMO, High Capacity Transit and Freight plans
- Directs staff to prepare final project analysis and air quality conformity, final documents, new regional transportation functional plan and findings

Regional Transportation Plan Ordinance:

- New RTP policy
- Investment strategy (projects)
- TSMO Plan
- Freight Plan
- High Capacity Transit Plan
- New Regional Transportation Functional Plan

Capacity Ordinance:

- New Regional Framework Plan Policy
- Actions to use UGB land more efficiently
- UGB expansion, if necessary
- Changes to Urban Growth Management Function Plan titles
- Changes to UGB code
- Changes to Boundary Change Code
- Performance measures



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 28, 2009
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Brian, Chair
Shane Bemis, Vice Chair
Sam Adams
Matt Berkow
Jody Carson
Nathalie Darcy
Dennis Doyle
Amanda Fritz
Carl Hosticka
Dick Jones
Robert Liberty
Keith Mays
Rod Park
Alice Norris
Rick VanBeveren
Mike Weatherby
Richard Whitman
Jerry Willey

AFFILIATION

Washington Co. Commission
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Portland
Multnomah County Citizen
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Washington Co. Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Portland
Metro Council
Clackamas Co. Special Districts
Metro Council
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Metro Council
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
TriMet Board of Directors
City of Fairview, representing Multnomah Co. Other Cities
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington Co. Other Cities

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Charlotte Lehan, Second Vice Chair
Ken Allen
Richard Burke
Pat Campbell
Jack Hoffman
Robert Kindel
Don McCarthy
Wilda Parks
Judy Shiprack
Steve Stuart
Dilafruz Williams

AFFILIATION

Clackamas Co. Commission
Port of Portland
Washington Co. Special Districts
City of Vancouver
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
City of North Plains, City in Washington Co. outside UGB
Multnomah Co. Special Districts
Clackamas Co. Citizen
Multnomah Co. Commission
Clark Co., Washington Commission
Governing Body of School Districts

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Ed Gronke
Donna Jordan

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County Citizen
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City

STAFF: Dick Benner, David Bragdon, Dan Cooper, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Kathryn Harrington, Milena Hermansky, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Sherry Oeser, Ken Ray, Ted Reid, Andy Shaw, Patty Unfred, Malu Wilkinson.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Tom Brian declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 5:17 p.m.

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Committee members and audience members introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. CONSIDERATION OF MPAC MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 12, 2009

MOTION: Councilor Jody Carson moved, and Mayor Mike Weatherby seconded, to approve the MPAC minutes from October 12, 2009.

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

5. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Robert Liberty provided an updated on:

- Title 13: Nature in Neighborhoods compliance and extension requests; and
- Former Minnesota Senator and Minnesota Law Professor Myron Orfield's recent visit to the region to address social equity principles. He thanked MPAC for co-sponsoring the event.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

6.1 Making the Greatest Place Summary of Public Comments Received

Ms. Patty Unfred and Mr. Ken Ray of Metro briefed the committee on staff's public involvement and engagement plan for Metro's Chief Operation Officer Recommendation on Making the Greatest Place. There were three key steps in the process of community engagement: information delivery, engagement and outreach, and collection and analysis of feedback. A preliminary draft report is available, and a final report with appendices will be available on the Metro web site shortly.

Additionally, staff briefly overviewed the summary of public comments received during the 30-day public comment period, which ended October 15, 2009:

- There was generally broad support to maintain a tight Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), and greater awareness of the concept of the UGB.

- With regard to Urban and Rural Reserves (URR), general opinion expressed providing maximum rural reserves. There was some skepticism over the process and uncertainty about the timeframe.
- Comments on transportation were diverse and tended to fall along interest lines, (e.g., bicycle advocates, freight interests, etc.)
- Other frequent categories included equity, affordable housing, and infrastructure finance.

The community also provided feedback on the public engagement process:

- There was positive feedback on the clarity of materials, transparency, and the newly-implemented policy newsfeed.
- Items that needed improving included the length of the public comment period, the quantity of information provided, and the location of hearings.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 Introduce final MPAC member amendments to Urban Growth Report resolution.

At the MPAC retreat October 23rd, the committee came to consensus on the need for more flexibility on large-lot industrial land in the UGR. Mr. Andy Cotugno of Metro briefed members on the proposed amendment to this portion of the UGR, which increases the range of large-lot industrial land available from 200-800 acres to 200-1,500 acres.

Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz of the City of Portland proposed that the following additional “Whereas” be added to Urban Growth Report resolution:

- “WHEREAS, state law requires Metro to provide capacity to encourage the availability of dwelling units at prices ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of households expected over the planning period; and
- “WHEREAS, Metro published a Housing Needs Analysis that showed the effects on housing affordability of forecast growth under existing policies and investment levels; and

In addition, the City requested to amend item 2 to read:

- “The Council accepts the “Urban Growth Report 2009-2030.... with its Housing Needs Analysis, attached and incorporated in this resolution....pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goals 14 and 10.”

Chair Tom Brian of Washington County and Mayors Denny Doyle of Beaverton, Keith Mays of Sherwood, and Jerry Willey of Hillsboro introduced a draft letter on behalf of Washington County to Metro Chief Operating Officer Michael Jordan requesting considerable expansion of the range of population and employment forecast as part of the Urban Growth Report process.

Committee members suggested the letter be modified with more specific language on proposed amendments and brought back to the committee at their November 18th meeting.

The committee is scheduled to make a recommendation on these amendments and the overall resolution to adopt the UGR at their November 18th meeting.

7.2 Introduce Final MPAC Member Amendments to Regional Transportation Plan Resolution.

Ms. Kim Ellis of Metro introduced Exhibit G (Consent items) to the RTP resolution and summarized staff recommendations on amendments to the draft RTP performance targets as proposed by MPAC at the retreat.

The committee discussed the proposed amendments. Suggestions included:

- Indicate specific numeric goals, rather than percent changes;
- Amend the definition of “access to daily needs” to add “relative to the general population” so the information is reported at a regional-level as well as for traditionally disadvantaged populations;
- Commissioner Fritz of Portland commented that the list of “essential destinations” as defined in the “Access to daily needs” performance target should be expanded to include places such as grocery stores, elementary schools and pharmacies; and
- Including safety per capita as component of the RTP performance target on safety to recognize the region’s growing population and account for all transportation users.

The committee also discussed concerns raised by Mayor Sam Adams regarding approving an RTP that does not meet state greenhouse gas emissions targets. Mr. Richard Whitman of the Department of Land Conservation Department encouraged the region to take interim steps by approving the RTP, recognizing more work is needed at the local and regional level. The scenarios work mandated by House Bill 2001 is several years from completion. Local plans can begin to address climate change with the new RTP policies. Not adopting the RTP is a recipe for doing nothing.

Mr. Rick VanBeveren of TriMet proposed to amend the draft RTP 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.”
- “Objective 4.5 Value Pricing – ~~Consider and selectively Promote as appropriate a broader application of value pricing as a potential management tool.~~”
- “Active transportation – By 2035, triple walking, biking, and transit ~~trips~~ mode share compared to 2005.”

The committee is scheduled to make a recommendation on these amendments and the overall resolution to accept the RTP at their November 18th meeting.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Tom Brian adjourned the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Milena B. Hermansky
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR OCTOBER 28, 2009:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
5	Memo	10/21/2009	Metro planners to MPAC, re: Title 13	102809j-01
6.1	Document	10/28/2009	MGP Public engagement strategy: by the numbers	102809j-02
6.1	Report	10/28/2009	MGP Engagement strategies and community response - Draft report	102809j-03
7.1	Memo	10/26/2009	Malu Wilkinson to MPAC re: Proposed amendment to the 2009 Urban Growth Report: range of large lot need	102809j-04
7.1	Document	10/28/2009	City of Portland Proposed Amendments Draft Resolution NO. 09-XXXX	102809j-05
7.1	Letter	10/28/2009	Washington County Proposed Amendments Resolution No. 09-XXXX	102809j-06
7.2	Memo	10/27/2009	Kim Ellis to MPAC, re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments Next Steps	102809j-07
7.2	Memo	10/28/2009	Kim Ellis to MPAC, re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Supplemental Consent Items	102809j-08
7.2	Document	10/28/2009	TriMet Recommended Amendments to draft RTP	102809j-09

 **Metro** | *Memo*

Date: November 10, 2009

To: Metro Council, MPAC, JPACT and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: RTP Climate Action Plan – Greenhouse Gas Emissions and House Bill 2001 Land use and Transportation Scenarios

During the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions has gained prominence at the regional, state, and national/international levels.

- In 2007, the Oregon Legislature established statewide targets for greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs).
- In 2009, the Legislature passed House Bill 2001, directing Metro to develop scenarios that will model then implement the most effective approaches to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions and per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
- Federal legislation is pending that would direct efforts to reduce GHG through transportation plans and investments.

Attached is a draft Regional Action Plan that describes how this RTP provides a baseline for the work ahead.

Transportation investments alone will not achieve the ambitious greenhouse gas emission targets set by the Oregon Legislature. In order to make a significant dent in our GHG emissions, the region will need to aggressively pursue land use, vehicle technology and pricing strategies along with transportation investments. This RTP establishes a framework for that work. The plan:

- Establishes a target for GHG emissions reduction and other outcomes-based measures
- Includes the region's first ever High Capacity Transit, Freight, and System Management plans
- Focuses more investment dollars in centers, corridors and employment areas
- Commits more money to bikes, pedestrians and transit than any previous RTP
- Demonstrates a reduction in vehicle miles traveled per capita, improved air quality and increases in walking, bike and the use of transit

Why is it important to adopt the RTP now?

- Investments: The RTP policy framework will be translated into project selection criteria in early 2010 to guide future investment decisions (e.g., MTIP allocations, federal reauthorization).
- Action not talk: The region needs to move from talking about actions to taking actions. The Action Plan and RTP resolution outlines a course of action that will be implemented at the local and regional levels.
- Legal requirements: State law requires us to adopt an RTP by June 2010.
- Making the Greatest Place: In December 2010, this region will need to decide how to accommodate jobs and housing for the next 20 years. The state component of the RTP includes a number of high capacity transit projects that will strongly influence the shape of our region. Absent those aspirations and land use actions to accommodate a majority of future growth in areas served by transit, we may be forced to expand the urban growth boundary in ways that do not support a reduction in GHG emissions.

The attached action plan could be amended into Chapter 5 of the RTP as the region's commitment to address this important issue prior to the next RTP update.

Regional Action Plan to proactively meet state and regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for the transportation sector in the Metro Area

BACKGROUND

During the update of the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions has gained prominence at the regional, state, and national/international levels. In 2007, the Oregon 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. These targets apply to all emission sectors, including energy production, buildings, solid waste, and transportation. Federal climate legislation, with targets and commensurate planning requirements to mitigate GHG emissions remain pending in Congress.

In 2008, the region examined a number of scenarios during the Making the Greatest Place process intended to best meet six regional outcomes, including minimizing contributions to global warming. Those scenarios provide a baseline for further work but did not demonstrate the necessary emission reductions to meet the long-term state and regional targets.

In general, the Portland region is leading the United States in reducing transportation-related GHGs. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita have been declining, transit and bike mode shares are increasing, and shorter trips have resulted due to compact, mixed-use urban form. The proposed RTP establishes an appropriate and timely policy direction by putting GHG reduction directly into the plan rather than waiting for a federal mandate, and it allows the region to begin work to address requirements set out in HB 2001 by the 2009 Legislature.

In HB 2001, the Legislature has directed Metro to: 1) evaluate a minimum of two land use/transportation scenarios that meet GHG reduction targets; 2) adopt a preferred scenario; and 3) adopt a plan for local government conformance. Local transportation system plans (TSPs), none of which meet state GHG goals, will also have to be revised following adoption of a preferred scenario. HB 2001 also calls for LCDC rulemaking in 2011 to establish a specific Metro-area target for the transportation-related emissions sector.

The targets set in the RTP simply reflects the overall GHG goal set by the Legislature of 75 percent reduction by 2050. The region's LCDC established target could be higher or lower when taking into account the other sectors of CO2 emissions (energy, buildings) and taking into account other parts of the state. A report on the scenarios is due to the Oregon Legislature on January 1, 2012, and scenario adoption would occur in 2014 as part of the next RTP update. Local conformance would follow.

DRAFT

ACTION PLAN

This action plan provides for a collaborative, technically sound approach to:

- 1) In 2009, adopt by resolution the transportation (RTP) and land use components (urban and rural reserves, urban growth report).
- 2) Build on the policy and technical work from the Making the Greatest Place initiative and Regional Transportation Plan update.
- 3) Meet HB 2001 GHG reduction requirements for the Metro area.
- 4) Ensure regional transportation investments included in the RTP and the MTIP best meet the adopted regional outcomes, including minimizing contributions to global warming.

SHORT-TERM STRATEGIES

JANUARY 2010-2012

- **Local transportation system plans** – TSP updates will begin in late-2010 to be consistent with the new RTP policies and targets, including reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program** – Metro Council and JPACT/MPAC revise the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) criteria to help the region select transportation investments that meet all the RTP performance targets including minimizing global warming. Multi-modal transportation investments within designated centers, corridors and employment areas should be the focus of investments.
- **Corridor refinement plans** - Investments identified through corridor refinement plan studies will be evaluated and prioritized on their ability to best leverage the region's desired outcomes, including minimizing contributions to global warming.
- **Local land use commitments and regional capacity ordinance work** – In December 2010, adopt a regional capacity ordinance that commits communities and the region to specific land use actions that minimize contributions to global warming.

GREENHOUSE GAS SCENARIO PLANNING

JANUARY 2010-DECEMBER 2014

Sections 37 and 38 of HB 2001 are 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 undertake such planning. In order to meet the state requirement, this action plan is based on three principles:

- **Regional collaboration.** Any effort to meet the state GHG goals and targets will require extensive outreach and discussion with elected leaders, stakeholders and the public.
- **Reasonable choices.** Scenarios and alternatives must include reasonable, agreed upon assumptions for land use and development patterns, mix of transportation investments, pricing strategies and technical transportation advancements related to vehicle fleets and fuels. Scenarios will be developed to achieve the six desired outcomes adopted through the Making the Greatest Place initiative.
- **Right tools for the right job.** To properly evaluate future scenarios, appropriate analysis tools and models will be developed and enhanced to better understand influences on land use and transportation GHG emissions.

Consistent with these principles, attached is the general timeline that identifies major deliverables, decision points, and events leading to the development and evaluation of scenarios and adoption of a recommended alternative to meet a target for GHG emission reductions in the transportation sector.

Greenhouse Gas Scenario Planning Draft Work Program and Timeline

Phase I – Scoping November 2009 – January 2010

Develop an overall scope of work and budget, refined timeline, project management and oversight processes, outreach and communication structures, governance structure, and inter-governmental agreements to complete the work.

Phase II – Research January – December 2010

Develop and enhance transportation, land use, and GHG forecasting models. Finalize baseline GHG inventory. Publish climate change background report(s). Establish policy basis for new tools, such as parking pricing, tolling and other strategies. Initiate public/stakeholder outreach.

Phase III – Scenario Development May – December 2010

Work with stakeholders to develop evaluation criteria and two scenarios intended to meet transportation-sector GHG targets. Continue public/stakeholder outreach.

Phase IV – Scenario Evaluation January – September 2011

Work with DLCD staff and other stakeholders to develop a recommended transportation-related GHG emissions reduction target. LCDC will adopt target in June 2011. Evaluate a baseline and two scenarios against criteria and refine scenarios, if necessary, to meet LCDC-adopted GHG targets.

Phase V - Public Review Process October – December 2011

Report on scenarios as defined in public/stakeholder outreach plan. Public review process results in a public comment report and accompanying transmittal to forward to the Oregon Legislature.

Phase VI – Scenario Selection January – September 2012

Provide a report to the 2012 Legislature on scenarios results and policy implications. Consider public comments and select preferred scenario to forward to next RTP. Initiate next RTP update in June 2012.

Phase VII – Regional and Local Implementation September 2012 - 2014

Incorporate preferred scenario into Regional Transportation Plan as part of RTP update. Identify local and regional actions needed to implement preferred scenario. Begin local plan updates and regional implementation.

DRAFT

 Metro | Memo

Date: November 9, 2009
To: MPAC and interested parties
From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Discussion items (Exhibit F) and Consent Items (Exhibit G) – RECOMMENDATION REQUESTED

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. **On November 4, MTAC recommended MPAC approval of Discussion items #1-5 as amended by TPAC and MTAC.**

MPAC discussed and considered each of these items on October 23 and 28.

- **#1:** Greenhouse gas emissions and RTP Climate Action Plan
- **#2:** RTP Performance targets and application of RTP policies and targets in local plans and local, regional and state investment priorities
- **#3:** Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities – factors to be used to develop technical rankings
- **#4:** Alternative mobility standards

MPAC may wish to discuss these items prior to action on November 18.

- **#3:** Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities - accept technical rankings and make prioritization recommendation
- **#5:** I-5/99W Connector Study Recommendations

- **Exhibit G (Consent Items for Consideration)** - This exhibit is proposed for approval on a “consent” basis on November 18 without further discussion. **On November 4, MTAC recommended MPAC approval of Exhibit G as amended by TPAC and MTAC.**

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

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.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

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

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 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 (required by state law) 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) on July 9, 2009, 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 (“TPR”), 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 of the TPR 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 significant reductions in transportation-related GHG emissions, and that land use strategies and pricing techniques are critical components of any comprehensive strategy to reduce GHG 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 select one scenario for regional and local implementation that meets the state targets; and

WHEREAS, the required scenario planning includes further development of tools and policies in Oregon that 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 adopted in Policy 1F, Highway Mobility Standards, of the Oregon Highway Plan; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC have recognized more work is needed to be consistent with Policy 1F; and

WHEREAS, a 30-day public comment period was held on the state and federal components 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 and Appendices 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 by March 31, 2010, for final public review.
4. Directs staff to work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments to prepare amendments to Exhibit E to this resolution and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan by March 31, 2010, to direct how local plans will implement the new RTP.
5. Directs staff to work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments in winter, 2010, to incorporate the new RTP policies and performance targets in the next policy update to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (“MTIP”).
6. Commits the Council to policy discussions on tolling, parking management and other pricing strategies in 2010 to inform the land use and transportation scenarios work to be developed in 2011.

7. Directs staff to work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios designed to reduce GHG emissions by January 1, 2012, as directed by the 2009 Legislature through House Bill 2001, and select one scenario for regional and local implementation that meets the state targets. Metro will forward recommendations from this effort to the next RTP update in 2014. Recommendations may include refinements to the RTP policies, performance targets and investment priorities.
8. Directs staff to work with the ODOT, TriMet and local governments to document the region's inability to meet current mobility standards as defined in Policy 1F of the Oregon Highway Plan and proposed actions to maintain state highway mobility "as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation" by March 31, 2010. This work may result in new alternative mobility standards and regional and local policies and actions needed to meet them.
9. 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 and submitted to LCDC in the manner of periodic review.

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

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

[CLICK HERE FOR REPORT](#)

September 15, 2009

Public review draft



2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Public review draft

September 15, 2009



Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

CLICK HERE FOR REPORT [September 2009](#)
Draft plan




REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

2010 – 2020

Draft plan

[September 2009](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR REPORT](#)



REGIONAL HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN

2035

Summary report

August 2009

[CLICK HERE FOR REPORT](#) September 15, 2009
Draft plan



REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN

2035

Draft plan

September 15, 2009

CHAPTER 3.08

DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN

NOTE: This draft document codifies current regional transportation functional plan language. The draft document will serve as a starting point for identifying additional functional plan provisions to direct how city and county plans will implement new RTP policies and implementation actions.

SECTIONS	TITLE
3.08.010	Purpose of Regional Transportation Functional Plan
TITLE 1:	DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS
3.08.110	Transportation Needs
3.08.120	Congestion Management
TITLE 2:	AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS
3.08.210	Amendments of City and County Transportation System Plans
TITLE 3:	REGIONAL STREET DESIGN
3.08.310	Design Standards for Street Connectivity
TITLE 4:	TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
3.08.410	Addressing Projects in Transportation System Plans
3.08.420	Transportation Project Analysis
TITLE 5:	REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT
3.08.510	Intent
3.08.520	Performance Standards
TITLE 6:	COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES
3.08.610	Metro Review of Amendments to Transportation System Plans
3.08.620	Extension of Compliance Deadline
3.08.630	Exception from Compliance
TITLE 7:	DEFINITIONS
3.08.710	Definitions

CHAPTER 3.08

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN

SECTIONS TITLE

3.08.010 Purpose of Regional Transportation Functional Plan

The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) implements those policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that cities and counties of the region will carry out in their comprehensive plans, transportation system plans (TSPs) and other land use regulations. The RTFP is intended to be consistent with federal law that applies to Metro in its role as a designated metropolitan planning organization, the Oregon Transportation Plan, and Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) and its Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). City and county TSPs must be consistent with the RTP, including its population and employment forecast; its determination of regional transportation needs; its system maps for street design, motor vehicles, public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians and freight; motor vehicle performance measures; and regional non-SOV modal targets. If a TSP is consistent with this RTFP, Metro shall deem it consistent with the RTP.

TITLE 1: DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS

3.08.110 Transportation Needs

- A. Each city and county shall determine its transportation needs, including needs for regional travel within the city or county, and consider modes, corridors and strategies to meet the needs.
- B. If a city or county provides for transportation needs in an urban reserve, it shall ensure planned improvements in the reserve are contingent upon addition of the reserve to the UGB and link to transportation facilities within the UGB.

3.08.120 Congestion Management

- A. Each city and county shall incorporate the appropriate motor vehicle level-of-service Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards in Table 3.16 of the RTP for regional facilities into its TSP for management of congestion on those facilities. A city or county may adopt alternative standards that do not exceed the minimums on Table 3.16 upon a demonstration that the alternative standards:
 - 1. Will not result in motor vehicle capacity improvements that shift unacceptable levels of congestion into neighboring jurisdictions along shared regional facilities;
 - 2. Will not result in motor vehicle capacity improvements to the principal arterial system as defined in Figure 3.16 that are not recommended in, or are inconsistent with, the RTP; or

3. Will not increase SOV travel to a measurable degree that affects local consistency with the modal targets in Table 3.17.
- B. Each city and county shall conduct its congestion analysis using the following steps:
1. Analysis: a transportation need is identified if congestion exceeds the deficiency threshold in Table 3.16 of the RTP.
 2. Accessibility: if a transportation need is identified, the city or county shall evaluate the effect of the congestion on regional accessibility using the best available quantitative and qualitative methods. If the city or county determines that the congestion will have a negative effect on regional accessibility, then the city or county shall follow the procedures set forth in subsection C of this section.
 3. Consistency: If amendments to comprehensive plans or land use regulations would significantly affect the function or capacity of a road, the city or county shall take one of the actions set forth in Title 4, section 3.08.420A, to maintain consistency between planned land uses and existing or planned transportation facilities.
- C. If congestion occurs on the principal arterial system as defined in Figure 3.6 or on the regional freight system as defined in Figure 7.13, the city or county responsible for developing a TSP for the area of congestion shall identify any unmet transportation need associated with the congestion in its TSP and propose one of the following actions:
1. Identify a proposed project at the time of Metro review of its TSP, but incorporate the project into the RTP during the next RTP update; or
 2. Propose an amendment to the RTP for more immediate unmet needs and projects.
- D. Each city and county shall consider the following strategies for managing congestion:
1. Transportation demand management that refine or implement a regional strategy in the RTP;
 2. Transportation system management, including intelligent transportation systems that refine or implement a regional strategy in the RTP;
 3. Sub-area or local transit, bicycle and pedestrian system improvements;
 4. Amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations to help achieve the city's or county's overall modal target;
 5. Improvements to parallel arterials, collectors or local streets, consistent with the connectivity standards in Title 3, in order to provide alternative routes;

6. Traffic-calming techniques;
 7. Change to the motor vehicle functional classification;
 8. Capacity improvement only upon a demonstration that other strategies in this subsection cannot solve the congestion problem in a cost-effective manner.
- E. Upon its conclusion that the strategies in subsection B would not be adequate or cost-effective to manage congestion, a city or county shall, in coordination with Metro, consider the following strategies:
1. Amend the 2040 Growth Concept design type for an area;
 2. Take an exception to the relevant RTFP requirement under Title 6;
 3. Amend the relevant policy in the RTP; and
 4. Designate the area an Area of Special Concern under Table 3.16.

3.08.130 Non-SOV Modal Targets

- DRAFT**
- A. Each city and county shall establish, and include in its TSP, non-SOV modal targets for trips into, out of and within all 2040 Growth Concept land design types within its jurisdiction. The targets shall be no lower than the Regional Non-SOV Modal Targets in Table 3.17 of the RTP.
- B. Each city and county, in coordination with TriMet and other regional agencies, identify actions in its TSP that will result in progress toward achievement of its non-SOV modal targets. Selection of actions shall be based initially upon consideration of:
1. Maximum parking ratios developed pursuant to Title 5;
 2. Regional street design considerations in Title 3;
 3. Transportation demand management strategies adopted pursuant to subsection 3.08.120D; and
 4. The role of transit in the area.

TITLE 2: AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLANS

3.08.210 Amendments of City and County Transportation System Plans

- A. When a city or county proposes to amend its TSP, it shall consider the strategies for managing congestion set forth in subsection 3.08.120D.

TITLE 3: REGIONAL STREET DESIGN

3.08.310 Design Standards for Street Connectivity

- A. To protect the integrity of the region’s transportation system, particularly to preserve the capacity of the region’s arterials for through trips, each city and county shall amend its TSP, if necessary, to comply with the mapping requirements and street design standards set forth in subsections B through E of this section.
- B. To improve local access, each city and county shall incorporate into its TSP a conceptual new streets map of all contiguous areas of vacant and re-developable lots and parcels of five or more acres that are zoned to allow residential or mixed-use development. The map should identify street connections to adjacent areas in a manner that promotes a logical, direct and connected system of streets and should demonstrate opportunities to extend and connect new streets to existing streets, provide direct public right-of-way routes and limit closed-end designs.
- C. If proposed residential or mixed-use development involves construction of a new street, the city or county shall require the applicant to provide a site plan that:
 - 1. Is consistent with the conceptual new streets map required by subsection B of this section;
 - 2. Provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections, except if prevented by barriers such as topography, rail lines, freeways or pre-existing development, or in leases, easements or covenants that existed prior to May 1, 1995;
 - 3. If streets must cross water features identified pursuant to Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (“UGMFP”), provides a crossing every 800 to 1,200 feet unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a full street connection;
 - 4. If full street connection is prevented, provides bicycle and pedestrian accessways on public easements or rights-of-way spaced such that accessways are not more than 330 feet apart, unless not possible for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3 of this subsection;

5. Provides for bike and pedestrian accessways that cross water features identified pursuant to Title 3 of the UGMFP at an average of 530 feet between accessways unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a connection;
6. If full street connection over water features identified pursuant to Title 3 of the UGMFP cannot be constructed in Centers as defined in Title 6 of the UGMFP or Main Streets shown on the 2040 Growth Concept Map, or if spacing of full street connections exceeds 1,200 feet, provides bike and pedestrian crossings at an average of 530 feet between accessways unless habitat quality or the length of the crossing prevents a connection;
7. Limits cul-de-sac designs or other closed-end street designs to circumstances in which barriers prevent full street extensions and limits the length of such streets to 200 feet and the number of dwellings along the street to no more than 25; and
8. Provides street cross-sections showing dimensions of right-of-way improvements and posted or expected speed limits.

B. City and county street design regulations shall allow:

1. Local streets of no more than 46 feet of total right-of-way, including:
 - a. Pavement widths of no more than 28 feet from curb-face to curb-face;
 - b. Sidewalk widths of at least five feet; and
 - c. Landscaped pedestrian buffer strips that include street trees.
2. Traffic calming devices, such as woonerfs and chicanes, to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds on local streets.
3. Short and direct right-of-way routes to connect residences with commercial services, parks, schools and other neighborhood facilities.
4. Opportunities to extend streets in an incremental fashion.

TITLE 4: TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

3.08.410 Addressing Projects in Transportation System Plans

- A. Each city or county developing or amending a TSP shall specify the general location of planned regional transportation facilities and improvements identified on the appropriate RTP map, subject to the project development requirements in this title. Except as otherwise provided in the TSP, the general location is as follows:

1. For new facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the location depicted on the appropriate RTP map;
 2. For interchanges, the general location of the crossing roadways, without specifying the general location of connecting ramps;
 3. For existing facilities planned for improvements, a corridor within 50 feet of the existing right-of-way; and
 4. For realignments of existing facilities, a corridor within 200 feet of the segment to be realigned as measured from the existing right-of-way depicted on the appropriate RTP map.
- B. The city or county shall adopt findings that explain how the chosen location complies with the city's or county's comprehensive plan, the RTP and applicable statewide planning goals. The general location of a planned regional transportation facility or improvement in a city or county TSP is consistent with the RTP if it is within the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map.
- C. A city or county may refine or revise the general location of a planned facility as it prepares or revises its TSP. Such revisions may be appropriate to reduce the impacts of the facility or to comply with comprehensive plan or statewide planning goal requirements. If, in developing or amending its TSP, a city or county determines that the general location of a planned facility or improvement is inconsistent with its comprehensive plan or a statewide planning goal requirement, it shall:
1. Propose a revision to the general location of the planned facility or improvement to achieve consistency and, if the revised location lies outside the general location depicted in the appropriate RTP map, seek an amendment to the RTP; or
 2. Propose a revision to its comprehensive plan to authorize the planned facility or improvement at the revised location.

3.08.420 Transportation Project Analysis

- A. If a city or county proposes a transportation project that is not included in the RTP, it shall consider the following in its Congestion Management System report as part of its project analysis:
1. Transportation system demand (such as access management, signal inter-ties and lane channelization) to address or preserve existing street capacity;
 2. Street design guidelines adopted pursuant to Title 3 of the RTFP, standards set forth on Figure 3.17 of the RTP, the implementing guidelines in *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040* (2nd Editions, 2002), or other similar resources consistent with regional street design policies.

3. The environmental design guidelines contained in *Green Streets: Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Street Crossings* (2002) and *Trees for Green Streets: An Illustrated Guide* (2002) or other similar resources consistent with federal regulations for stream protection.
- B. If the city or county decides not to build the project, it shall inform Metro so that Metro can amend the RTP to delete the project and address transportation need that gave rise to the project in an alternative way.
- C. This section does not apply to city or county transportation projects that are financed locally and would be undertaken on local facilities.

TITLE 5: REGIONAL PARKING MANAGEMENT

3.08.510 Intent

- A. The State's Transportation Planning Rule calls for reductions in vehicle miles traveled per capita and restrictions on construction of new parking spaces as a means of responding to transportation and land use impacts of growth. The Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for more compact development as a means to encourage more efficient use of land, promote non-auto trips and protect air quality. In addition, the federally-mandated air quality plan adopted by the state relies on full achievement of the transportation objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept. Notably, the air quality plan relies upon reducing vehicle trips per capita and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios. This title addresses these state and federal requirements and preserves the quality of life of the region.
- B. A compact urban form requires that each use of land is carefully considered and that more efficient forms are favored over less efficient ones. Parking, especially that provided in new developments, can result in less efficient land use and lower floor to area ratios. In areas where transit is provided or other non-auto modes (walking, biking) are convenient, less parking can be provided and still allow accessibility and mobility for all modes, including autos. Substitution of non-auto modes for auto trips can reduce congestion and increase air quality.

3.08.520 Performance Standards

- A. Cities and counties shall amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations, if necessary, to meet or exceed the following minimum parking standards:
 1. Cities and counties shall require no more parking than the minimum as shown on Table 3.08-2, Regional Parking Ratios.
 2. Cities and counties shall establish parking maximums at ratios no greater than those listed in Table 3.08-2 and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. The

designation of A and B zones on the Parking Maximum Map should be reviewed after the completion of the Regional Transportation Plan and every three years thereafter. If 20-minute peak hour transit service has become available to an area within a one quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for light rail transit, that area shall be added to Zone A. If 20-minute peak hour transit service is no longer available to an area within a one-quarter mile walking distance for bus transit or one-half mile walking distance for light rail transit, that area shall be removed from Zone A. Cities and counties should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.

3. Cities and counties shall establish an administrative or public hearing process for considering ratios for individual or joint developments to allow a variance for parking when a development application is received which may result in approval of construction of parking spaces either in excess of the maximum parking ratios; or less than the minimum parking ratios. Cities and counties may grant a variance from any maximum parking ratios.
- B. Free surface parking shall be subject to the regional parking maximums provided for Zones A and B. Parking spaces in parking structures, fleet parking, parking for vehicles that are for sale, lease, or rent, employee car pool parking spaces, dedicated valet parking spaces, spaces that are user paid, market rate parking or other high-efficiency parking management alternatives may be exempted from maximum parking standards by cities and counties. Reductions associated with redevelopment may be done in phases. Where mixed land uses are proposed, cities and counties shall provide for blended parking rates. Cities and counties should count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards.
- C. Cities and counties may use categories or measurement standards other than those in the Regional Parking Ratios Table but must demonstrate that the effect will be substantially the same as the application of the Regional Parking Ratios.
- D. Cities and counties shall provide data to Metro on an annual basis that demonstrates compliance with the minimum and maximum parking standards, including the application of any variances to the regional standards in this title. Collection of other building data should be coordinated with Metro.
- E. Cities and counties shall provide for the designation of residential parking districts in local comprehensive plans or implementing ordinances.
- F. Cities and counties shall amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to require that parking lots more than three acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways, including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips. Major driveways in new residential and mixed use areas shall meet the connectivity standards

for full street connections as described in Section 6.4.5 of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.

TITLE 6: COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES

3.08.610 Metro Review of Amendments to Transportation System Plans

- A. Cities and counties shall amend their TSPs to comply with the RTFP, or an amendment to it, within two years after its acknowledgement or after such later date specified in the ordinance that amends the RTFP. The COO shall notify cities and counties of the compliance date.
- B. Cities and counties that amend their TSPs after acknowledgment of the RTFP or an amendment to it, but before two years following its acknowledgment, shall make the amendments in compliance with the RTFP or the amendment. The COO shall notify cities and counties of the date of acknowledgment.
- C. One year following acknowledgment of the RTFP or an amendment to it, cities and counties whose TSPs do not yet comply with the RTFP or the amendment shall make land use decisions consistent with the RTFP or amendment. The COO, at least 120 days before the specified date, shall notify cities and counties of the date upon which RTFP requirements become applicable to land use decisions. The notice shall specify which requirements become applicable to land use decisions in each city and county.
- D. An amendment to a city or county TSP shall be deemed to comply with the RTFP if no appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals is made within the 21-day period set forth in ORS 197.830(9), or if an appeal is made and the amendment is affirmed, upon the final decision on appeal. Once the amendment is deemed to comply with the RTFP, the RTFP shall no longer apply directly to city or county land use decisions.
- E. An amendment to a city or county TSP shall be deemed to comply with the RTFP as provided in subsection D only if the city or county provided notice to the COO as required by subsection F.
- F. At least 45 days prior to the first public hearing on a proposed amendment to a TSP, the city or county shall submit the proposed amendment to the COO. The COO may request, and if so the city or county shall submit, an analysis of compliance of the amendment with the RTFP. Within four weeks after receipt of the notice, the COO shall submit to the city or county a written analysis of compliance of the proposed amendment with the RTFP, including recommendations, if any, that would bring the amendment into compliance with the RTFP. The COO shall send a copy of its analysis to those persons who have requested a copy.
- G. If the COO concludes that the proposed amendment does not comply with RTFP, the COO shall advise the city or county that it may:

1. Revise the proposed amendment as recommended in the COO's analysis;
 2. Seek an extension of time, pursuant to section 3.08.620, to bring the proposed amendment into compliance;
 3. Seek an exception to the requirement, pursuant to section 3.08.630; or
 4. Seek review of the noncompliance by JPACT and the Metro Council, pursuant to subsections H and I of this section.
- H. The city or county may postpone further consideration of the proposed amendment and seek review of the COO's analysis under subsection F of this section by JPACT within 21 days from the date it received the COO's analysis. JPACT shall schedule the matter for presentations by the city or county and the COO at the earliest available time. At the conclusion of the presentations, JPACT, by a majority of a quorum, shall decide whether it agrees or disagrees with the COO's analysis and shall provide a brief written explanation as soon as practicable.
- I. The city or county may seek review of JPACT's decision by the Metro Council within 10 days from the date of JPACT's written explanation. The Council shall schedule the matter for presentations by the city or county and the COO at the earliest available time. At the conclusion of the presentations, the Council, by a majority of a quorum, shall decide whether it agrees or disagrees with JPACT's decision and shall provide a brief written explanation as soon as practicable.
- J. A city or county that adopts an amendment to its TSP shall send a copy of the ordinance making the amendment to the COO within 14 days after its adoption.

3.08.620 Extension of Compliance Deadline

- A. A city or county may seek an extension of time for compliance with the RTFP by filing an application on a form provided for that purpose by the COO. Upon receipt of an application, the Council President shall set the matter for a public hearing before the Metro Council and shall notify the city or county, JPACT, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) and those persons who request notification of applications for extensions.
- B. The Metro Council shall hold a public hearing to consider the application. Any person may testify at the hearing. The Council may grant an extension if it finds that: (1) the city or county is making progress toward compliance with the RTFP; or (2) there is good cause for failure to meet the compliance deadline.
- C. The Metro Council may establish terms and conditions for an extension in order to ensure that compliance is achieved in a timely and orderly fashion and that land use decisions made by the city or county during the extension do not undermine the ability of the city or county to achieve the purposes of the RTFP requirement. A term or condition must

relate to the requirement of the RTFP for which the Council grants the extension. The Council shall not grant more than two extensions of time, nor grant an extension of time for more than one year.

- D. The Metro Council shall issue an order with its conclusion and analysis and send a copy to the city or county, JPACT, the DLCD and any person who participated in the proceeding. The city or county or a person who participated in the proceeding may seek review of the Council's order as a land use decision described in ORS 197.015(10)(a)(A).

3.08.630 Exception from Compliance

- A. A city or county may seek an exception from compliance with a requirement of the RTFP by filing an application on a form provided for that purpose by the COO. Upon receipt of an application, the Council President shall set the matter for a public hearing before the Metro Council and shall notify JPACT, the DLCD and those persons who request notification of requests for exceptions.
- B. Following the public hearing on the application, the Metro Council may grant an exception if it finds:
 - 1. It is not possible to achieve the requirement due to topographic or other physical constraints or an existing development pattern;
 - 2. This exception and likely similar exceptions will not render the objective of the requirement unachievable region-wide;
 - 3. The exception will not reduce the ability of another city or county to comply with the requirement; and
 - 4. The city or county has adopted other measures more appropriate for the city or county to achieve the intended result of the requirement.
- C. The Council may establish terms and conditions for the exception in order to ensure that it does not undermine the ability of the region to achieve the policies of the RTP. A term or condition must relate to the requirement of the RTFP to which the Council grants the exception.
- D. The Council shall issue an order with its conclusion and analysis and send a copy to the city or county, JPACT, the DLCD and those persons who have requested a copy of the order. The city or county or a person who participated in the proceeding may seek review of the Council's order as a land use decision described in ORS 197.015(10)(a)(A).

TITLE 7: DEFINITIONS

3.08.710 Definitions

For the purpose of this functional plan, the following definitions shall apply:

- A. "Accessibility" means the amount of time required to reach a given location or service by any mode of travel.
- B. "Accessway" means right-of-way or easement designed for public access by bicycles and pedestrians, and may include emergency vehicle passage.
- C. "Alternative modes" means alternative methods of travel to the automobile, including public transportation (light rail, bus and other forms of public transportation), bicycles and walking.
- D. "Bikeway" means separated bike paths, striped bike lanes, or wide outside lanes that accommodate bicycles and motor vehicles.
- E. "Boulevard design" means a design concept that emphasizes pedestrian travel, bicycling and the use of public transportation, and accommodates motor vehicle travel.
- F. "Capacity expansion" means constructed or operational improvements to the regional motor vehicle system that increase the capacity of the system.
- G. "Chicane" means is a permanent barrier used to prevent cars from driving across a pedestrian or bicycle accessway.
- H. "Connectivity" means the degree to which the local and regional street systems in a given area are interconnected.
- I. "COO" means Metro's Chief Operating Officer or the COO's designee.
- J. "DLCD" means the Oregon state agency under the direction of the Land Conservation and Development Commission.
- K. "Design type" means the conceptual areas depicted on the Metro 2040 Growth Concept Map and described in the RFP including Central City, Regional Center, Town Center, Station Community, Corridor, Main Street, Inner Neighborhood, Outer Neighborhood, Regionally Significant Industrial Area, Industrial Area and Employment Area.
- L. "Full street connection" means right-of-way designed for public access by motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles.
- M. "Growth Concept Map" means the conceptual map depicting the 2040 Growth Concept design types described in the RFP.

- N. "Improved pedestrian crossing" means a marked pedestrian crossing and may include signage, signalization, curb extensions and a pedestrian refuge such as a landscaped median.
- O. "JPACT" means the Joint Policy Advisory Committee, composed of elected officials and agency representatives involved, that makes recommendations to the Metro Council on transportation planning and projects.
- P. "Landscape strip" means the portion of public right-of-way located between the sidewalk and curb.
- Q. "Land use decision" shall have the meaning of that term set forth in ORS 197.015(10).
- R. "Land use regulation" means any local government zoning ordinance, land division ordinance adopted under ORS 92.044 or 92.046 or similar general ordinance establishing standards for implementing a comprehensive plan, as defined in ORS 197.015.
- S. "Level-of-service (LOS)" means the ratio of the volume of motor vehicle demand to the capacity of the motor vehicle system during a specific increment of time.
- T. "Local trips" means trips that are five miles or shorter in length.
- U. "Median" means the center portion of public right-of-way, located between opposing directions of motor vehicle travel lanes. A median is usually raised and may be landscaped, and usually incorporates left turn lanes for motor vehicles at intersections and major access points.
- V. "Metro" means the regional government of the metropolitan area, the elected Metro Council as the policy-setting body of the government.
- W. "Metro boundary" means the jurisdictional boundary of Metro, the elected regional government of the metropolitan area.
- X. "Mixed-use development" includes areas of a mix of at least two of the following land uses and includes multiple tenants or ownerships: residential, retail and office. This definition excludes large, single-use land uses such as colleges, hospitals, and business campuses. Minor incidental land uses that are accessory to the primary land use should not result in a development being designated as "mixed-use development." The size and definition of minor incidental, accessory land uses allowed within large, single-use developments should be determined by cities and counties through their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances.
- Y. "Mobility" means the speed at which a given mode of travel operates in a specific location.

- Z. "Mode-split target" means the individual percentage of public transportation, pedestrian, bicycle and shared-ride trips expressed as a share of total person-trips.
- AA. "Motor vehicle" means automobiles, vans, public and private buses, trucks and semi-trucks, motorcycles and mopeds.
- BB. "Motor vehicle level-of-service" means a measurement of congestion as a share of designed motor vehicle capacity of a road.
- CC. "Multi-modal" means transportation facilities or programs designed to serve many or all methods of travel, including all forms of motor vehicles, public transportation, bicycles and walking.
- DD. "Narrow street design" means streets with less than 46 feet of total right-of-way and no more than 28 feet of pavement width between curbs.
- EE. "Non-SOV modal target" means a target for the percentage of total trips made in a defined area by means other than a private passenger vehicles carrying one occupant.
- FF. Performance measure" means a measurement derived from technical analysis aimed at determining whether a planning policy is achieving the expected outcome or intent associated with the policy.
- GG. "Person-trips" means the total number of discrete trips by individuals using any mode of travel.
- HH. "Regional vehicle trips" are trips that are greater than five miles in length.
- II. "Residential Parking District" is a designation intended to protect residential areas from spillover parking generated by adjacent commercial, employment or mixed use areas, or other uses that generate a high demand for parking.
- JJ. "RFP" means Metro's Regional Framework Plan adopted pursuant to ORS chapter 268.
- KK. "Routine repair and maintenance" means activities directed at preserving an existing allowed use or facility, without expanding the development footprint or site use.
- LL. "RTFP" means this Regional Transportation Functional Plan.
- MM. "Shared-ride" means private passenger vehicles carrying more than one occupant.
- NN. "Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity for multi-modal arterials." An increase in SOV capacity created by the construction of additional general purpose lanes totaling 1/2 lane miles or more in length. General purpose lanes are defined as through travel lanes or multiple turn lanes. This also includes the construction of a new general purpose highway facility on a new location. Lane tapers are not

included as part of the general purpose lane. Significant increases in SOV capacity should be assessed for individual facilities rather than for the planning area.

- OO. "Significant increase in Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) capacity for regional through-route freeways." Any increase in SOV capacity created by the construction of additional general purpose lanes other than that resulting from a safety project or a project solely intended to eliminate a bottleneck. An increase in SOV capacity associated with the elimination of a bottleneck is considered significant only if such an increase provides a highway section SOV capacity greater than ten percent over that provided immediately upstream of the bottleneck. An increase in SOV capacity associated with a safety project is considered significant only if the safety deficiency is totally related to traffic congestion. Construction of a new general purpose highway facility on a new location also constitutes a significant increase in SOV capacity. Significant increase in SOV capacity should be assessed for individual facilities rather than for the planning area.
- PP. "SOV" means a private passenger vehicle carrying one occupant (single-occupancy vehicle).
- QQ. "Substantial compliance" means city and county comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, on the whole, conform with the purposes of the performance standards in the functional plan and any failure to meet individual performance standard requirements is technical or minor in nature.
- RR. "Throughway" means limited-access facilities that serve longer-distance motor vehicle and freight trips and provide interstate, intrastate and cross-regional travel.
- SS. "TPR" means the administrative rule entitled Transportation Planning Rule adopted by the Land Conservation and Development to implement statewide planning Goal 12, Transportation.
- TT. "Traffic calming" means street design or operational features intended to maintain a given motor vehicle travel speed.
- UU. "TriMet" means the regional service district that provide public mass transit to the region.
- VV. "TSP" means a transportation system plan adopted by a city or county.
- WW. "UGB" means an urban growth boundary adopted pursuant to ORS 268.390(3).
- XX. "Woonerf" means a street or group of streets on which pedestrians and bicyclists have legal priority over motor vehicles.

Exhibit F to Resolution No. 09-XXXX



Date: November 9, 2009

To: MPAC and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments - Discussion Issues (Exhibit F) –
RECOMMENDATION REQUESTED

Attached to this memo is a summary of five discussion issues and MTAC recommendations for your consideration on November 18:

- **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
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
MTAC recommended the technical ratings presented in this item for your consideration. Local letters of commitment and support will be provided under separate cover. How should the five proposed corridor refinement plans be prioritized for completion?
- **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.

RTP CLIMATE ACTION PLAN - 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.

TPAC and MTAC 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 2011.
- MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council commitment to policy discussions on the application of pricing strategies in the Metro region in 2010.
- Between 2011 and 2014, develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios" designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles and adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment.
- 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 1 includes proposed changes recommended by MTAC on October 21 and November 4, MPAC at the October 23 retreat and TPAC on November 2.
- 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.

TPAC AND MTAC 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 2011.
- Monitor the regional-level performance targets as part of periodic updates to the RTP.
- In Winter 2010, develop functional plan amendments to direct how local plans will be consistent with the new RTP policies and performance targets.
- Identify 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.
- 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 2011. 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.

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. MTAC and TPAC recommended the amendments on November 2 and 3, respectively.

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 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</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.

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

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

also recommended targets be set for each mode rather than as an aggregate as proposed. TPAC and MTAC recommend 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

MTAC and TPAC discussed the importance of highlighting the RTP is not currently required to meet any of the performance targets, including the state greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. The performance targets are self-imposed and intended to be used to show how the region is performing as a baseline for the HB 2001 scenarios work and future RTP updates. Furthermore, the HB 2001 scenarios work program should allow sufficient time and iterations of analysis to inform refinements to the performance targets.

TPAC recommended that local plans not be required to evaluate local transportation system plan performance relative to the regional-level performance targets because local governments do not currently have the tools, resources or expertise to conduct this analysis. Tools, resources and expertise in the region will be further developed as part of the HB 2001 climate change scenarios work program presented in Discussion item #1. MTAC recommended that functional plan amendments be developed in 2010 to direct how local plans will be consistent with the new RTP policies and targets.

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.

TPAC AND MTAC 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.

TPAC AND MTAC RECOMMENDATION:

- JPACT and MPAC consideration of the prioritization data in Attachment 2. 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.

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

PAGE 1		RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION RATING (November 10, 2009)													
Rankings are: 1= Low 2 = Med 3 = High	Description	Portland Central City to Wilsonville, including Tigard-Sherwood/Newberg/Tualatin, including Barbur/1-5 South				Portland Central City Loop, including 5/1-405 Downtown Loop		Clark County to I-5 via Gateway, Oregon City and Tualatin, including I-205				Cities of East Multnomah County to Damascus (between I-84 and US 26)		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>	High	Medium	Low	Medium	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	
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 SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS]															
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support (# of jurisdictions)	8 agencies or jurisdictions									1 agency comment	8 agencies, local MOU & Resolution		1 agency		
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration	2 groups										7 groups		5-agency scope letter		
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				n/a		n/a				n/a		n/a		n/a	
GRAND TOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES				39.5		36.6				37.0		34.0		34.3	

Discussion Item #4 Attachment 2

Page 2 RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION MATRIX: **RAW DATA + SOURCES** FOR REFERENCE (November 10, 2009)

Numbers represent raw data as identified in the description of the measure (below), except where data is multi-sourced, requires compilation or is somewhat qualitative. In those cases, the scores represent rankings, rather than raw numbers, and are designated (ranking) in the Data Source column. Rankings are: 1= Low; 2 = Med; 3 = High	Description	Portland Central City to Wilsonville, Including Tigard-Sherwood/Newberg/Tualatin, including Barbur/ I-5 South	Portland Central City Loop, including -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 (between I-84 and US 26)	Beaverton to Forest Grove (Tualatin Valley Highway)	
	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 Average	(62.2%	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%	Jobs: 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										



**Local letters of support and
commitment**

Exhibit F to Resolution No. 09-XXXX

Discussion Item #4

From: Ottenad, Mark [mailto:ottenad@ci.wilsonville.or.us]
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 8:21 PM
To: Deborah Redman
Cc: Bowers, Michael; Lashbrook, Stephan; Young, Sandi; Neamtzu, Chris; Elissa Gertler (elissager@co.clackamas.or.us); Cowan, Danielle; Ron Weinman (ronw@co.clackamas.or.us); Mayor Tim Knapp; Charlotte Lehan-Office (clehan@co.clackamas.or.us)
Subject: S Metro I-5 Corridor: Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20

Hi Deb,

Please find attached the August 2009 letter to JPACT from the four mayors of the I-5 South Metro Portland region supporting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan, which is listed by Metro as Mobility Corridors 2 and 3.

Four specific measures of local commitment are identified below.

1. Local support:

There are a number of regionally significant issues to be addressed by the proposed Mobility Corridors Study of Corridors 2, 3 and 20, all of which serve the greater Southwest Metro Portland 'travel-shed.' These issues are of such considerable importance that the four mayors of I-5 South Metro Portland region—Lake Oswego, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville—all signed onto a letter early in the corridor refinement process.

Areas of regional agreement include maintaining capacity on I-5 for the movement of freight, providing better transit and active transportation improvements and developing regionally significant industrial areas north of Wilsonville and south of Tualatin.

Issue of potential conflict include the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route Southern Arterial that facilitates commuter traffic and increases congestion on I-5 and other key arterials, contrary to the goals and objectives of the draft 2035 RTP. The corridor study is necessary to determine mitigation measures on I-5 and I-205 and associated interchanges and ramps.

2. Community Interest:

Community interest in protecting I-5 mobility and capacity are of considerable interest to the Southwest Metro Portland business community, especially for industrial employers that move freight. Area residents are also concerned about negative environmental, watershed and traffic impacts of the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route Southern Arterial.

All three chambers of commerce of the Southwest Metro region—Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville—have indicated strong support for the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan in order to encourage logical, cost-effective transportation improvements that facilitate the conduct of commerce.

3. Need and Readiness for Corridor Refinement Planning:

A Mobility Corridor refinement plan is greatly needed for the Southwest Metro Portland region in order to determine transportation solutions to implement land-use plans or local aspirations within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Issues related to readiness and urgency include planning activities of the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route Southern Arterial and other arterials. Collectively, the three-arterial Connector concept directly impacts three major I-5 interchanges and the I-5/I-205 junction. Continued residential and employment growth in the Southwest Metro Portland region requires that Metro and local jurisdictions plan carefully for how commuters will travel to work and how industrial employers can timely move large volumes of freight.

Specific issues that require land-use or investment “certainty” to permit public and private investment or planning to go forward include determining if or where the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route Southern Arterial will go forward. Uncertainty around the Connector is one of several issues contributing to an inability for development of the regionally significant industrial lands north of Wilsonville and south of Tualatin.

There is considerable need to avoid decisions that may cause problems down the line—e.g., loss of right-of-way or construction of incompatible uses. For example, initial corridor planning for the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route Southern Arterial showed a large increase in primarily commuter traffic on the most-congested segment of I-5 in Oregon, thereby removing freeway capacity for the movement of freight, and overwhelming the capacity of the I-5/N Wilsonville interchange, which was designed to serve the emerging regionally significant industrial area north of Wilsonville and south of Tualatin.

Refinement planning for this corridor needs to be completed sooner in order to make logical, beneficial decisions pertaining to proposed roadways like the I-5/99W Connector Route’s proposed system of arterials and other potential roadway improvements designed to access regionally significant industrial lands.

A 2006 report by Oregon Transportation Improvement Group (OTIG), a consortium of private-sector companies involved in a flagship public-private transportation partnership with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), highlighted the immediate importance of evaluating I-5/99W Connector optional ‘connections’ to I-5, design restrictions and evaluating weaving/merging issues along this I-5 corridor.

4. Local Resource Commitment:

Wilsonville commits to working with Metro, ODOT and local jurisdictions in terms of in-kind and monetary resources to leverage the regional commitment. For example, Wilsonville’s Public/Government Affairs Director worked with the Mayors of Lake Oswego, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville to raise the profile of the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan and to develop the South Metro Mayors’ I-5 Corridor Refinement Plan Letter. Wilsonville’s Community Development Director and City Engineer spent over two years actively participating in the Executive Management Team examining the issues around the I-5/99W Connector Route and are willing to assist in the new mobility corridor study. Wilsonville plans to fund its TSP update concurrent with the corridor refinement plan in order to maximize planning efficiencies and produce a better quality, more informed product that contributes to regional mobility.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

- Mark

Mark C. Ottenad
Public/Government Affairs Director
City of Wilsonville
29799 SW Town Center Loop East
Wilsonville, OR 97070
General: 503-682-1011
Direct: 503-570-1505
Fax: 503-682-1015
Email: ottenad@ci.wilsonville.or.us
Web: www.ci.wilsonville.or.us

DISCLOSURE NOTICE: Messages to and from this E-mail address may be subject to the Oregon Public Records Law.



file

August 7, 2009

The Honorable David Bragdon, President
The Honorable Carlotta Collette, District 2 Councilor;
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)
The Honorable Carl Hosticka, District 3 Councilor
Metro Council
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

RE: Mayors of South Metro Cities Support for “I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan – Wilsonville to North Tigard,” RTP Project #11062

Dear Council President Bragdon and Councilors Collette and Hosticka:

All four mayors of the South Portland metropolitan cities of Lake Oswego, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville are writing to request your active support of the “I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan – Wilsonville to North Tigard,” Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project #11062. Specifically, we seek the region’s assistance to elevate the priority of this project as the ‘next corridor’ study for the 2035 RTP.

Based on Metro’s recent work-product entitled, *Mobility Investment Track - Summary of Needs and 2007 Federal Priorities*, dated May 2009, the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan is listed more often than any other refinement plan as a 2035 RTP Investment Priority in five key mobility corridors, including:

- Corridor #2 – Portland Central City to Tualatin
- Corridor #3 – Tualatin to Wilsonville
- Corridor #7 – Tualatin to Oregon City
- Corridor #19 – Beaverton to Tigard
- Corridor #20 – Tigard/Tualatin to Sherwood

The Oregon Department of Transportation reports that the portion of the South Metro I-5 Corridor between Highway 217 and I-205 is the busiest stretch of highway in Oregon—over 156,000 vehicles per day. ODOT also reports that the I-5 Boone Bridge over the Willamette River carries nearly as much traffic as the Columbia River Crossing CRC “project of national significance” and handles one-third more freight than the CRC:

I-5 Major Bridges Daily Traffic Volume			
I-5 Bridge	TOTAL VOLUME	Truck %	Truck Vol
Interstate CRC	126,600	18%	22,788
Boone Bridge	122,300	28%	34,244
Vol Difference	-4,300		11,456
% Difference	-3.5%		33.5%

Furthermore, ODOT has indicated in the Metro Urban/Rural Reserves process that the South Metro I-5 Corridor and Boone Bridge is reaching maximum traffic-handling capacity, and will require a “huge” investment of over \$500 million to remedy.

The core reason for this extensive impact on regional corridors is that congestion and chokepoints on the South Metro I-5 Corridor directly impact the operations of Hwy 217 and I-205 — the most crucial highways of the Portland region. And in turn, cities along these routes like Beaverton, Gladstone, Happy



Valley, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Portland and West Linn are directly affected. Other entities such as the Port of Portland and traded-sector industries are also impacted by the operation of the South Metro I-5 Corridor when freight shipments are slowed or unpredictably delayed. Thus, while we mayors of the South Portland region are writing in support of this the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan project, the project benefits multiple jurisdictions and economic interests around the region.

A completed I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan will help determine logical cost-benefit investment decisions on I-5 connectivity enhancements, improved access controls and effective methods of alleviating freight mobility chokepoints in several jurisdictions adjacent to I-5. Reducing the impact of system congestion, capacity constraints and traffic hotspots has been advocated by the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force as key issues for the regional freight transportation system.

Additionally, the Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force is advocating that freight-oriented preservation, management and investment priorities should focus on "the core throughway system bottlenecks to improve truck mobility in and through the region," specifically citing that "hotspots of note include...the I-5 South corridor." The I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan directly addresses these issues and explores potential solutions that help the region to avoid costly investments that may not be beneficial and to selectively target public investments for maximum benefit.

In conjunction with the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan project, we also support JPACT's nomination of the High Capacity Transit Corridor number 11, "Portland to Sherwood in the vicinity of Barbur/Hwy 99W Corridor (LRT)" as the region's highest-ranked "Near Term Regional Priority" for study. Examining improved transit options in this larger mobility corridor complements the road study of the I-5 South Plan.

As the region considers future investments in transportation improvements and new urban-growth boundary expansion areas, such as the Coffee Creek industrial area or the Tualatin-Sherwood-Wilsonville area, the region will be better served when we have quantified the limitations of and identified potential modifications within the South Metro I-5 Corridor, which carries more traffic and freight than any other highway segment in Oregon.

We thank you for your time and consideration and look forward to working with the region to advance the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan as a critical tool to improve system mobility and reliability that benefits all metro-area jurisdictions and West Coast commerce.

Sincerely,

Jack Hoffman
Mayor, City of Lake
Oswego

Craig Dirksen
Mayor, City of Tigard

Lou Ogden
Mayor, City of Tualatin

Tim Knapp
Mayor, City of
Wilsonville

- cc: Honorable Lynn Peterson, Chair, Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
- Honorable Ted Wheeler, Chair, Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
- Honorable Tom Brian, Chair, Washington County Board of Commissioners
- Jason Tell, Director, Region 1, Oregon Department of Transportation
- Bill Wyatt, Executive Director, Port of Portland



smba

south metro business alliance

August 24, 2009

Council President David Bragdon
Councilor Carlotta Colette, JPACT Chair
Councilor Carl Hosticka
Metro Council Office
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear President Bragdon and Councilors Colette and Hosticka:

For the past few months, the businesses in the south metro area have become much more active and attentive to the transportation needs and concerns in our communities. Our mutual interest in identifying and implementing solutions for the growing traffic congestion and infrastructure planning needs led us to form the South Metro Business Alliance and we are writing you all in that capacity.

I have personally met with Councilor Colette and Councilor Hosticka to share the concerns my colleagues and I have expressed and are now contacting you in hopes of making some progress toward addressing some of those concerns. I understand you have or will be receiving a letter from five mayors of cities in the south metro area supporting a study of the I-5 Corridor in this portion of the region, as directed in Metro Regional Transportation Project Item # 11062.

We are quite pleased our elected leaders support launching the study and want to add our voice of support in favor of moving forward with the project. There is a caveat we would like to offer as well from the perspective of the businesses that rely on transportation infrastructure to maintain the economic underpinnings of the community. That caveat is quite simple and straightforward so allow me to elaborate.

While many transportation studies of this area have already been conducted, we will support completing another one, as long as it is done within the framework of the recommendations drafted into Alternative 7, the plan created by the Policy Steering Committee of the Hwy 99 I-5 Task Force. The members of SMBA believe Alternative 7 should serve as a platform for any additional conversations about transportation in this area. Further, it should be the starting point for moving forward. The new study should not be conducted in a vacuum as though no work or thought has been given to the needs and concerns of this community to date and hence our recommendation.



smba

south metro business alliance

President David Bragdon
Councilor Colette
Councilor Hosticka

Page 2

In addition, the study of the needs along the I-5 corridor from Highway 217 to the Boone Bridge should not preclude the commencement of transportation projects that are ready to begin and which address mutually agreed upon existing needs. In other words, this study should not be undertaken in lieu of beginning to conduct work on vital connectivity projects that are desperately needed in our neighborhoods. Our community has waited for many years to have these critical transportation issues addressed and we cannot support simply conducting another survey to determine if there are serious needs to be addressed. There are serious needs and they need to be addressed immediately.

The economic vitality of our entire region depends upon the safe and efficient flow of traffic along I-5 through our towns. As business owners and operators, we are convinced this portion of the region cannot afford any more missteps or missed opportunities. The transportation planning and growth management of this area must become a priority of every elected leader in this region before the economic downturn we are currently experiencing becomes an economic disaster.

I appreciate your diligent attention to the issues I've raised over the past few months and would be happy to invite you all to meet with us if it would serve any productive outcome. In the meantime, you should feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I look forward to learning of your intended actions on these matters and you can be assured we will continue to work with you and the community to find sound solutions to the traffic and transportation issues in our area.

Sincerely,

Trey Chanter
Rasmussen Mercedes

Cc: Commission Chairman Tom Brian
Commissioner Roy Rogers
Jason Tell, ODOT Region 1 Director
SMBA Members



Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

7688 SW Capitol Highway, Portland, OR 97219 (503) 823-4592

October 21, 2009

Sue Keil, Director, Portland Bureau of Transportation
1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Mobility Corridor Refinement Plan

Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. (SWNI) urges the City of Portland, ODOT and Metro to select the I-5/99W mobility corridor, Portland Central City to Tigard (corridor #2) for the next Corridor Refinement Plan. This includes Barbur Boulevard and feeder routes as described in Metro's "Atlas of Mobility Corridors."

Significant congestion occurs frequently on I-5, causing significant local congestion on Barbur Blvd., Capitol Highway, Taylors Ferry Road, Terwilliger Blvd., Macadam Ave. and other arterials and local streets. Many of the freeway on and off-ramps are located on local streets, creating backups in our neighborhoods, especially when the local colleges are in session or when I-5 is at a stall.

We support the Active Transportation initiative and worked with you to develop a proposal for Barbur Blvd. and other key routes to develop a network that would make these routes safer to walk or ride a bicycle. Most of the arterials and collectors in our coalition area have significant sections of missing sidewalks and bike paths, and it is difficult to travel to schools and shops without depending on an automobile.

The corridor refinement plan is critically important at this time to evaluate how the selection of Barbur as a near-term priority for high-capacity transit will allow Barbur to accommodate all modes of transportation (transit, bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles) while preserving livability in the neighborhoods and the economic vitality of the commercial businesses in the corridor. If not done right, the addition of high-capacity transit on Barbur could result in loss of auto and freight capacity, housing, businesses, greenspaces and habitat, have a negative impact on mobility, and exacerbate congestion on adjacent transportation routes in neighborhoods.

We urge you to make the I-5/99W mobility corridor a high priority for the next Corridor Refinement Plan.

Sincerely,

Brian Russell
President
Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

cc: Metro, ODOT



**OFFICE OF
MAYOR
SAM ADAMS**

1221 SW Fourth Ave,
Suite 340
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 823-4120
mayorsamadams.com



Tri-County Metropolitan
Transportation District
of Oregon
710 NE Holladay St
Portland, OR 97232
(503) 238-RIDE
trimet.org

October 28, 2009

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Chair Collette,

The City of Portland and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (TriMet) are excited about the selection of the I-5 South/Barbur Blvd/99W corridor (Portland to Sherwood) as a Tier 1 High Capacity Transit (HCT) alignment in the recently adopted Regional HCT Plan. While we just initiated service on the Green Line in September and are currently in design of the Yellow Line to Milwaukie, it is important that we begin the process of project planning and development for an HCT line from downtown Portland to Tigard and Sherwood.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has stated that we need a multimodal, multi-facility Mobility Corridor Refinement Plan for the corridor that includes both I-5 and Barbur Boulevard. This Corridor Refinement Plan will evaluate the needs for all modes so that decisions on High Capacity Transit can be made within the context of total mobility needs. For this reason it is critical that the efforts be concurrent.

Therefore, we strongly urge JPACT to designate the I-5 South/Barbur Blvd/99W corridor (Portland to Sherwood) as the Next Corridor for Corridor Refinement Planning and the next High Capacity Transit corridor and allocate the \$500,000 in federal funds set aside in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to this effort. We also urge JPACT to support a request of \$2.5 million in FTA Alternatives Analysis funding for the next federal appropriations cycle for the high capacity transit work.

Sincerely,

Sam Adams
Mayor
City of Portland

Fred Hansen
General Manager
TriMet

October 29, 2009



City of Tigard

Councilor Carlotta Collette, JPACT Chairperson
David Bragdon, Metro Council President
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736



Re: Tigard's Support for Refinement Planning for the I-5 South/Barbur Blvd/Hwy 99W High Capacity Transit Corridor

Dear Councilor Collette and President Bragdon,

I wish to express Tigard's enthusiasm and commitment to participating in a Mobility Corridor Refinement Plan encompassing the Barbur Blvd/Highway 99W High Capacity Transit Corridor and the adjacent Interstate 5 Corridor because of the importance of concurrently planning for all travel modes. A concurrent effort is essential to developing an integrated and well-functioning transportation system.

The corridor refinement planning effort is a vital step towards achieving Tigard's (and the Region's) urban growth and livability aspirations. We see it as essential to achieving Tigard's aspirations to redevelop its Downtown, the Highway 99W Corridor, Tigard Triangle, and the Washington Square Regional Center as compact urban areas. These areas have the potential to accommodate thousands of dwellings and jobs and the urban amenities necessary for prosperity, sustainability and a high-quality of life for the region's existing and future residents.

The Corridor Refinement Planning Project would directly support Tigard's current and future policy planning efforts and the investments being made to achieve its aspirations. For example, city residents approved the formation of the Downtown Urban Renewal District and since then an investment of several million dollars in transportation facilities and amenities have been made, or committed, for the near future including West Side Commuter Rail; major downtown street reconstruction; improvements to Fanno Creek Park and major intersection improvements on Hall, Greenburg, Main and 99W intersections.

Tigard has also taken a strong policy position consistent with the need to develop an integrated multi-modal transportation system combined with a supportive land use pattern. This is evidenced in a number of City Council decisions such as support for the West Side Commuter Rail; adoption of the Highway 99W Improvement and Management Plan (2007); development of future urban design vision studies for Downtown Tigard and Highway 99W (2008, 2009) and adoption of the Washington Square Regional Center Master Plan (2005). Furthermore, the city is updating its Transportation System Plan which emphasizes an integrated multi-modal transportation system. Tigard will also soon be working with Metro, Tri-Met and ODOT to


develop a Highway 99W/Barbur Blvd. Land Use Plan with a specific emphasis on development of a transit-supportive land use pattern.

Tigard is doing many other things, which in aggregate emphasize its readiness to participate in an I-5/Barbur Blvd/99W Corridor Refinement Plan. These include development and future adoption of downtown urban design standards and circulation plan; citywide pathway master planning; working with ODOT to infill missing sidewalk lengths on Highway 99W and signal modernization along the length of the facility.

The interest and support in the principles embodied in a corridor refinement planning effort extends throughout the community. Citizens have actively sought additional information about future high capacity transit by participating in events such as the recent Tigard/Interstate LRT tour organized by TriMet and Tigard business leaders. Tigard citizens have consistently shown a high level of concern about the future of the transportation system, particularly Highway 99W, through community surveys and workshops

We believe that selection of this corridor as a multimodal, multi-facility Mobility Corridor Refinement Plan including both I-5 and Barbur Blvd/Highway 99W, is a decision that is most supportive of the region's goals to implement the Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan. Therefore, we ask JPACT to make that selection and allocate the \$500,000 in federal funds set aside in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to this timely and important effort.

Sincerely,



Craig E. Dirksen, Mayor
City of Tigard

cc: Chair Tom Brian, Washington County Board of Commissioners
Mayor Keith Mays, City of Sherwood
Mayor Sam Adams, City of Portland
Mayor Ron Shay, King City
Gail Achterman, Oregon Transportation Commission
Robin McArthur, Metro
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Jason Tell, ODOT
Matt Garret, ODOT
Fred Hansen, TriMet
Alan Lehto, TriMet



November 2, 2009

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Chair Collette,

Washington County strongly supports the I-5 South-Barbur Boulevard-Highway 99W Corridor (Portland to Sherwood) as a Tier 1 High Capacity Transit (HCT) alignment in the recently adopted Regional HCT Plan. It is time for the Region to initiate the process of project planning and development for a HCT line from downtown Portland to Tigard and Sherwood. To be successful, this effort must also be coordinated with other supportive planning efforts.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) identified the need for a Corridor Refinement Plan of Barbur Boulevard and Interstate 5. This Plan will evaluate the requirements for all transportation modes and inform the decisions on High Capacity Transit within the context of total mobility needs. It is prudent public financial policy that these two planning efforts be concurrent. Consistent with this thinking, Washington County believes the Interstate 5 Multimodal Corridor Plan should be addressed in phases. Phase one should include the Highway 217 and Carmen Drive interchange areas. Doing the planning in this way should conserve limited funding and allow another priority corridor to be studied.

The Washington County Board of Commissioners calls on JPACT to identify the Interstate-5 South-Barbur Boulevard-99W Corridor as the Region's next High Capacity Transit Corridor, and to support the initiation of a phased Mobility Corridor Plan. In support of this direction, JPACT is also asked to: 1) Set aside \$500,000 in Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds for the Multimodal Mobility Corridor planning effort. 2) Support a request for \$2.5 million in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding for the initial High Capacity Transit Corridor work in the next federal appropriations cycle.

Sincerely,

Tom Brian
Chairman

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
November 2, 2009
Page Two

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Rogers'.

Roy Rogers
Commissioner, District 3

cc: David Bragdon, Metro Council President
Kathryn Harrington, District 4 Metro Councilor
Carl Hosticka, District 3 Metro Councilor
Sam Adams, Mayor, City of Portland
Fred Hansen, General Manager, TriMet



October 30, 2009

Councilor Carlotta Collette
Members of JPACT
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232


Dear Councilor Collette and Members of JPACT:

As you consider how to best prioritize and fund corridor refinement plans for our region, I encourage you to provide funding for the I-5 Corridor study as the highest priority for the betterment of the entire region. My recommendation and request comes based on the following considerations:

- Studies and data provided by ODOT substantiate the Boone Bridge currently supports more north-south commercial traffic than the Columbia River Crossing, making it potentially the most economically significant transportation structure in the region.
- For more than 20 years, the region has struggled with the challenges associated with creating better access to Interstate 5 in the southern area of the region from Wilsonville and Tualatin north to Interstate 217. The time has come to address the concerns that have been identified over the past 20 years.
- A regional Task Force of local elected leaders and community stakeholders collectively studied the I-5 Hwy 99 Connector and supported the implementation of the I-5 Corridor Refinement Study and recommended it be launched as soon as possible.
- Regional support from the business organizations, including the SMBA and the chambers of Tualatin, Sherwood and Wilsonville, have all notified Metro of their support for the I-5 Corridor Refinement Study, as well as individual business owners and operators from the south metro area.

Based on this overwhelming community support from every segment of our region, I urge you to unanimously recommend to Metro Council that the I-5 Corridor Refinement Study be funded and launched as soon as possible.

Respectfully,


Trey Chanter

Cc: Councilor Carl Hosticka
Mayor Lou Ogden
Mayor Keith Mays
Mayor Tim Knapp



October 29, 2009

Metro Council/JPACT
c/o Metro
Planning and Development
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Subject: Corridor Refinement Planning

Dear Metro Council Members, JPACT members, and Metro Staff:

City of Milwaukie views the proposed approach to mobility corridor refinement planning as a significant revision to how refinement planning was viewed in the past, and how it was assumed to function by the City during our recent TSP update process. The previously adopted corridor refinement work plan and the City of Milwaukie TSP called for additional study of what are now called corridors 10 and 11 under the aegis of a future refinement planning effort. This was done at ODOT's recommendation. The City is very concerned that the proposed policy could push the onus and responsibility for integrating the mobility function with local land use goals on to localities. While recognizing there are scarce regional resources for planning work, the City is very concerned that such a shift would leave the City with few options. In the City's corridors (#'s 9 & 10), existing land uses and intersections are out of step with the declared ODOT function, there are serious fundamental problems with how the two corridors connect, and the potential for "up-stream" changes like the Sunrise corridor will dramatically change the functional context of these highways. The City believes that it is unrealistic to categorize the facilities as ready for project development, if that indeed is what is assumed by excluding these corridors from any future refinement effort.

The City is very concerned that a gap in this process has been opened, and the City's very significant issues (better defined as questions through the recent TSP) may fall into this gap. In addition, the City would propose that the "local" community-building issues (as opposed to regional mobility issues) are not local only: they are precisely the kind of issue that must be tackled effectively if the region expects to support growth and development within the existing urbanized area.

Sincerely,

Kenny Asher
Community Development and Public Works Director



CITY of BEAVERTON

4755 S.W. Griffith Drive, P.O. Box 4755, Beaverton, OR 97076 TEL: (503) 526-2481 Fax (503) 526-2571

DENNY DOYLE
MAYOR

November 2, 2009

The Honorable David Bragdon, President
Metro Council
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97232-2736

Dear David,

The draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan identifies OR 8 Tualatin Valley Highway (TV Highway) as a Regional Mobility Corridor that serves two Regional Centers. The corridor needs further refinement due to its failure to perform at current standards; therefore, Metro is requesting letters of support to assist in determining which corridor will be funded and studied next. The City of Beaverton requests that the TV Highway corridor be the subject of the next corridor refinement study.

TV Highway serves as an important east/west connection in Washington County. The highway has a high priority function connecting the Beaverton and Hillsboro Regional Centers. The need for a corridor refinement plan has long been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan to define the function, classification, and performance standards for the roadway. There is a long-standing challenge of how to accommodate capacity and land use access along this corridor. The Washington County and Beaverton Transportation System Plans called for a seven-lane TV Highway placeholder project and a long-range grade separation of TV Highway and both Murray Blvd. and Farmington Road. Even with these improvements assumed in the model, the segment through Beaverton fails to perform. A corridor refinement plan will evaluate trade offs of a variety of capacity and system improvements in a broad "corridor" study area which includes parallel street network improvements, access management, transportation system management, and operational improvements to highway intersections.

Within the Beaverton Regional Center, there is a Special Area Plan that was developed for the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan and is contained in its appendix. This Special Area Plan notes that even with nearly twenty additional north/south and east/west roadway segments added within the Beaverton Regional Center for better connectivity, access, and capacity needed to implement the density and mixed uses of a Regional Center, TV Highway fails to perform to standard.

Mr. David Bragdon
November 2, 2009
Page Two

The City of Hillsboro was recently awarded a TGM grant from ODOT for a TV Highway Corridor Plan. In talks between Washington County, Hillsboro, Beaverton, Metro and TriMet staff, there is agreement to expand the study area to the regional center boundaries to answer the broader questions of function and classification of the highway. While this funded corridor plan will provide a good portion of information needed for Metro's Corridor Refinement Plan, there is likely to be additional work needed for further refinements to TV Highway and the local street network, as well as for implementation of the plan in Beaverton. Anything not covered by the TGM funds could be funded through Metro's process, thus leveraging both funding sources for a huge benefit for the public dollar and a complete study for the Metro region that will serve Washington County, Hillsboro, Beaverton and all cities adjacent to their boundaries.

Please consider this significant added benefit as you make the decision about what Corridor Refinement Plan to fund next. In essence, such a big bang for the public dollar could also allow an additional Corridor Refinement Plan to be conducted at the same time resulting in a two for one benefit to the region.

Please feel free to contact me or Margaret Middleton at 503.526.2424 if you need additional information regarding our support for this critical study.

Sincerely,



Denny Doyle
Mayor



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES
MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

Land Use and Transportation Planning Program
1600 SE 190th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97233-5910
(503) 988-3043

November 2, 2009

Councilor Carlotta Collette, JPACT Chair
David Bragdon, Council President
Metro
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Ms. Collette and Mr. Bragdon:

Subject: I-84/US-26 Connection(s) – Mobility Corridor 15 Refinement Plan – Demonstration of Local Support

On behalf of the cities of East Multnomah County, I respectfully submit this packet of materials to demonstrate the strong level of support for Metro to initiate the CRP (Corridor Refinement Plan) addressing connections between I-84 and US 26, and Mobility Corridor 15 for the East Metro area generally between 181st/182nd Avenue and 257th Avenue/Kane Road, and between I-84 and Damascus.

The need for this CRP is long-standing, and support for it has increased since Metro prioritized it as one of the top corridors for refinement planning in 2005. In the absence of a State route, local roads in East Metro serve inter- and intra-state trips traveling between I-84 and US-26. Since the 1980s, numerous transportation studies with a variety of approaches and outcomes have been done in search of an answer to the I-84/US 26 connection problem. These include:

- 1989 - Mt. Hood Parkway Study
- 1997 - 257th Avenue Enhancement Study
- 2002 - 242nd Ave/Hogan Rd. Traffic Impact Analysis
- 2005 - East Metro Area Advanced Transportation and Telecommunications Corridor Assessment Study
- 2007 - Portland Freight Data Collection Report.

It is time to complete a CRP in East Metro that allows the region to identify and make appropriate transportation investments.

The I-84/US-26 Connection(s) – Mobility Corridor 15 CRP is a critical regional investment: The regional CRP for the area generally between 181st/182nd Avenue and 257th Avenue/Kane Road is necessary to make informed transportation investment decisions that support development of vacant and underutilized industrial lands and at least six regional and town centers, including

Letter to C. Collette and D. Bragdon
November 2, 2009
Page Two

Damascus, to foster economic growth and maintain and enhance the livability of East Metro communities. The refinement plan will consider a full range of mobility and accessibility solutions and recommend improvements for the connection of I-84 and US 26. Solutions and recommended improvements will support local communities affected by this traffic to develop to their full potential.

In 2007, the cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village entered into a MOU (Memorandum of Understanding), agreeing to the need for a comprehensive plan of strategic transportation investments in East Multnomah County to achieve planned economic and community goals and aspirations. The primary concern was, and continues to be, the connection between I-84 exits 13 (N.E. 181st Avenue), 15 (Fairview Parkway), 16 (238th Avenue) and 17 (257th Avenue) and US 26. At the time of the MOU, the presumed solution was a limited access freeway, like OR 217 in Washington County. While there was consensus the corridor needed improvement, each city was concerned how a highway would affect livability and traffic flow in their respective community.

With the State RTP Update and the Making the Greatest Place planning process, the concerns expanded to include East Metro mobility and connectivity between the I-84 corridor and the Damascus area. The draft State RTP update specifically recommends a corridor refinement plan be conducted for the Fairview/Wood Village/Troutdale/Gresham to Damascus mobility corridor (Mobility Corridor #15).

The I-84/US-26CRP is consistent with State and Regional Plans and Policies, and addresses the Economy, Environment, and Equity: This CRP will allow the region to maximize 2040 land uses within the current UGB. Setting a “best practice” example, this CRP will determine the most efficient use of existing transportation infrastructure to serve areas that have acreage for both housing and employment growth. This plan will set an example of how to best use existing resources within the UGB, thereby minimizing the need for its expansion.

East County has long been considered a conglomeration of bedroom communities serving those working in other areas of the region. In reality, these communities have expanded their mix of uses and include one regional center and five town centers. East Metro jurisdictions are making great efforts to attract jobs and have increased allowable densities to provide more opportunities to live and work within the same community. For example, the City of Gresham recently updated its Downtown Plan to allow for a higher density of mixed uses. The City is also reviewing allowed densities along arterial corridors to strategically prepare for future growth within the UGB. Also, industrial land in the Columbia Cascade River District and the Springwater Plan Area are well-positioned to become significant employment locations for nearby residential communities that are increasingly home to under-employed and minority populations.

Through the CRP, the region can comprehensively analyze existing transportation infrastructure, plan the necessary improvements and act. By doing, so we can attract the businesses able to provide jobs for the future, bring those jobs closer to where people live, promote transportation choices and improve access and mobility.

East Metro town and regional centers will proportionately contribute to Making the Greatest Place, and the region should invest in planning to help achieve their potential. Several of the centers and corridors are well positioned for redevelopment based on age and quality of housing and commercial stock.

One example of the link between the CRP and achieving land use goals is illustrated by the Rockwood Town Center. Currently, the National Highway System runs through the town center. This is a challenge to redevelop the area with land uses that fulfill the regional expectations of a town center. The CRP will help identify the appropriate local arterials for through freight movement. Additionally, the CRP will identify strategic, cost-effective investments that provide multi-modal choices for the movement of people, goods and services.

There is strong Local Support and Community Interest for this CRP: This CRP is widely supported in the East Metro region and beyond. Included in our attached materials are letters of support from Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, the cities of Damascus, Fairview, Gresham, Sandy, Troutdale and Wood Village, the East Metro Economic Alliance, West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, Columbia Corridor Association, Gresham Downtown Development Association, Mt. Hood Community College, and Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations.

The interest in corridor planning remains strong although the understanding of what constitutes success has changed in the two decades the East County jurisdictions have looked for transportation solutions. There is general consensus that no “silver-bullet” solution exists. We recognize the transportation solutions lie with the existing network of arterials, not in the construction of a new throughway. It will be a comprehensive set of strategic smaller scale investments throughout the corridor that is the “silver buck-shot”.

To this end, the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee requested 242nd/Hogan Road be reclassified in the RTP from a Principal Arterial to Major Arterial, a commitment to scaling that arterial in a manner consistent with community land use aspirations.

The CRP is Needed and the East Metro Region is Ready to move forward: The East Metro jurisdictions will make better investment decisions if we understand current and projected constraints on our arterials, and the most appropriate solutions to address those constraints. As demonstrated by numerous attempts, this cannot be accomplished by

Letter to C. Collette and D. Bragdon
November 2, 2009
Page Four

separate analyses done independently by local jurisdictions. The regional approach of a CRP is vital to assessing the problems and solutions for travel between I-84 and US-26, and within the East Metro area.

Further delay of planning will continue to exacerbate inter-jurisdictional challenges to defining appropriate investments and how they might be phased. We need a coordinated investment program; otherwise "spot" improvements may be made that negatively impact neighboring cities or are limited in their effectiveness – both locally and regionally.


This CRP will benefit from previously completed studies that provide some baseline data. The CRP is effectively scoped by the recognition that a limited-access arterial is not the solution, but that our multiple local arterials will be the baseline network. Refinement planning is needed to analyze a suite of cost effective solutions comprised of smaller-scale capital projects, TSMO, and high-quality/enhanced bus service along with longer-term HCT investments that will support the development of vacant and underutilized industrial and the (re)development of regional and town centers.

There is a commitment of Local Resources to this CRP: Substantial local resources have been spent on transportation studies of the corridor in the last decade. There is agreement at the political level for the need to provide technical and in-kind resources and monetary support for the CRP in order to leverage regional participation. At this time, the Cities and Multnomah County are committed to providing meaningful monetary contributions to the effort that will need to be negotiated once the corridor is selected and the scope and timeframe of the CRP is defined. Agency work programs and budgets will be adopted to reflect all levels of support negotiated through the project IGA process.

The East Metro refinement planning has high cost-benefits for the region compared to other needed CRPs. It is not about a new regional "mega-project". This CRP's recommendations will spotlight investments that address both current needs on our local streets and getting ahead of problems that will otherwise emerge as the East Metro cities grow into their aspirations over time.

The Cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village, and Multnomah County urge JPACT and the Metro Council to select the East Metro corridor as the region's next refinement plan.

Best regards,


Jane McFarland, Principal Planner

Attachments

East Multnomah County Transportation Committee

City of Fairview City of Gresham City of Troutdale City of Wood Village Multnomah County

July 16, 2009

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Attn: Carlotta Collette, Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2739

SUBJECT: Funding the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan through East Multnomah County

For many years now, there has been a significant and growing need for additional transportation capacity in East Multnomah County for commercial traffic between I-84 and US 26. As populations have shifted east, the roads of the region are moving far more personal vehicles and commercial traffic than ever intended.

Economic development in the east metro area is a shared interest of Multnomah County; the Cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale, and Wood Village (Cities); Clackamas County and its incorporated cities. Improved north-south transportation connection between I-84 and US 26 is essential for fostering the east regional industrial areas, including the Columbia-Cascade River District, Springwater, and Damascus. The east metro cities acknowledge the need to agree on how to solve this issue.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among the Cities dated April 26, 2007 and approved via resolution by the city of Damascus noted the I-84 to US 26 corridor as the primary transportation concern of the area. The four possible alternatives mentioned in the MOU are; 181 Avenue, Fairview Parkway, 242nd Avenue and 257th Avenue. This corridor has been identified as a regional need as recently as the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan and has been included by JPACT on the list of the five most crucial regional corridors for refinement planning. The MOU also acknowledged improvements are needed to the east-west I-205 to US 26 corridor as its second priority. The Cities and neighboring jurisdictions are relying on the results of an independent and unbiased comprehensive study of the I-84 to US 26 Corridor to effectively plan their transportation and economic futures.


The East Multnomah County Transportation Committee (EMCTC) urges you to take the necessary steps to make the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan the highest priority for a corridor study in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan in compliance with the

2007 MOU dated April 26, 2007. The Cities and Multnomah County will work cooperatively with Metro, the Oregon Department of Transportation, and other regional partners to conduct a comprehensive study in accordance with the MOU, to reach consensus on a preferred corridor alternative(s), and jointly advocate for its implementation.

Sincerely,




Commissioner Diane McKeel, EMCTC Chair, Multnomah County Commissioner, Dist 4



Larry Cooper, Councilor – City of Fairview



David Widmark, Councilor – City of Gresham



Jim Kight, Mayor – City of Troutdale



Dave Fuller, Mayor City of Wood Village

Enc: List of supporters for funding an I84 to US 26 corridor study.

List of Supporters of the request by EMCTC to JPACT to make the I-84 to US 26 Corridor (Corridor 15) the highest priority for a corridor study in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan:

- 1) Multnomah County Board of Commissioners, by Resolution, September 3, 2009
- 2) Cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village, Memorandum of Understanding, April 26, 2007
- 3) City of Sandy, letter, July 23, 2009
- 4) City of Damascus, letter, September 14, 2009
- 5) East Metro Economic Alliance, letter , August 13, 2009
- 6) West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce, letter, September 14, 2009
- 7) Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce, letter via fax, August 10, 2009
- 8) Columbia Corridor Association, letter, August 28, 2009
- 9) Gresham Downtown Development Association, letter, August 27, 2009
- 10) Mt. Hood Community College, letter, September 15, 2009
- 11) Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations, September 9, 2009

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

RESOLUTION NO. 09-108

Endorsing the Request of the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation for Inclusion of Funding for a Comprehensive Study of the 1-84to US 26 Corridor in the 2009 Revision of the Regional Transportation Plan

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners Finds:

- a. As of July 1, 2008, the combined population of the cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale and Wood Village (Cities) increased by 11.4% from the 2000 Census, according to estimates by the Population Research Center at Portland State University.
- b. East Multnomah County contains large amounts of unutilized and underutilized land designated for industrial development such as the Columbia Cascade River District, the Gresham Strategic Investment Zone, and the Springwater Area.
- c. Economic development in the area is dependent on a clear understanding of current and future transportation needs.
- d. The Cities wish to maintain the livability and character of their respective cities while accommodating the expected growth and needed economic development.
- e. The 1-84to US 26 corridor was recognized as a need of the metropolitan region in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan.
- f. JPACT has listed 1-84to US 26 as one of the five crucial corridors for corridor refinement plan.

The Multnomah County Board of Commissioners Resolves:

1. To endorse the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's letter dated July 16, 2009, requesting the inclusion of funding for a comprehensive transportation study of the 1-84to US 26 corridor in the 2009 revision of the RTP. A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit "A".
2. To work cooperatively with; the Cities, Metro, the Oregon Department of Transportation, and other affected regional parties to conduct a comprehensive study of the corridor, reach consensus on preferred corridor alternatives, and jointly advocate for its implementation.

ADOPTED this 3rd day of September 2009.



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON



Ted Wheeler, Chair

REVIEWED:

AGNES SOWLE, COUNTY ATTORNEY
FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By



Matthew O. Ryan, Assistant County Attorney

SUBMITTED BY:

Diane McKeel, Commissioner District 4

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

WHEREAS, economic development in the east metro area is an important and shared concern of the Cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale, and Wood Village ("Cities"); and

WHEREAS, the Cities believe that improving the north-south transportation corridors connecting US 26 and I-84 is essential for fostering economic development in the area; and

WHEREAS, the Cities believe that improving the east-west transportation corridors connecting US 26 and the Sunrise Corridor to neighboring commerce centers in northern Clackamas County is likewise essential for economic development in the region; and

WHEREAS, the 2005 East Metro Area Advanced Transportation and Telecommunications Assessment Study identified the need for the equivalent of new arterial lanes in the corridor by 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Cities acknowledge the need to reach an agreement on how to solve the corridor issues is necessary; and


WHEREAS, this issue is of regional and statewide significance.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Cities agree that:

1. Metro and/or the Oregon Department of Transportation should embark on a Comprehensive Corridor Study as soon as possible; and
2. The Cities recommend that the study include an analysis of 181st, Fairview Parkway, 242nd and 257th from I-84 to an improved interchange at US 26 with the stipulation that the analysis of the 242nd route be limited to consideration of the road being constructed below grade from north of Halsey Street to a minimum of ¼ mile south of Glisan; and
3. The Cities recommend that north-south improvements from I-84 to US 26 be made the first priority for regional improvements; and
4. The Cities also recommend that the east-west corridor improvements from I-205 to US 26, the Sunrise Corridor, be made the second priority for regional improvements; and
5. Multnomah County should take part and help develop the parameters for this study with representatives of the Cities involved in the study process; and

6. The Cities will work cooperatively with Metro, the Oregon Department of Transportation, and other regional partners to reach agreement on a preferred corridor alternative and jointly advocate for its implementation.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Memorandum of Understanding as of the date of last signature below.




Mayor Mike Weatherby, City of Fairview Date

 5/10/07

Mayor Shane Bemis, City of Gresham Date

 5/9/07

Mayor Paul Thatrofer, City of Troutdale Date



Mayor David Fuller, City of Wood Village Date

Chair Ted Wheeler, Multnomah County Commission

Revised Version (4-16-2007)

Revised Version (4-26-2007)

RECEIVED

JUL 23 2009

CITY RECORDER'S OFFICE
CITY OF TROUTDALE



CITY OF
SANDY

39250 Pioneer Boulevard • Sandy, OR 97055

Phone 503-668-5533
Fax 503-668-8714
www.cityofsandy.com

Gateway to Mt. Hood

July 20, 2009


Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Attn: Carlotta Collette, Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2739

Ms. Collette,


The economic development of the East Metro area depends on a clear analysis of transportation needs of the area. Roads must have the capacity to handle current traffic demand and to adapt for the future.

The City of Sandy supports the request by the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee to identify the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan as a regional priority in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan. We believe the Refinement Plan will provide the information necessary to identify appropriate transportation investments needed to foster economic growth and provide adequate statewide freight mobility.

Sincerely,



Linda K. Malone, Mayor
City of Sandy



City of
Damascus

19920 SE Highway 212
Damascus, OR 97089

September 14, 2009

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Attn: Carlotta Collette, Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2739

SUBJECT: Support for the Request by East Multnomah County Transportation Committee to identify the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan as a Regional Priority in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan

The economic development of the East Metro area depends on a clear analysis of transportation needs of the area. Roads must have the capacity to handle current traffic demand and to adapt for the future.

The City of Damascus supports the request by the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee to identify the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan as a regional priority in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan. We believe the Refinement Plan will provide the information necessary to identify appropriate transportation investments needed to foster economic growth and provide adequate statewide freight mobility.

Sincerely,

Jim Wright, Mayor
City of Damascus

Cc: East Multnomah County Transportation Committee ✓



East Metro
Economic
Alliance

August 13, 2009

President
Brian Lessler

President Elect
Tom Perrick

Secretary
Dr. John Sygielski

Treasurer
Barb Cardinale

Executive Director
Travis Stovall

Councilor Carlotta Collette, Chair JPACT
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

RE: EMCTC Support of the 2007 Memorandum of Understanding

Dear Chair Collette:

We have worked hard to demonstrate a broad base of support for obtaining funds for a corridor study for a North-South route to assist with transit in and through East County. Another demonstration of this support was a recent letter submitted by the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee (EMCTC). The letter highlighted yet an additional show of support for the study being funded and completed.

East Metro Economic Alliance (EMEA) business members have strongly stated the desire to have this significant transportation need studied and a solution developed. We fully support EMCTC's board support to have the study completed. We encourage funding the study without delay to allow for continued economic development competitiveness on a regional, national and global stage.

We appreciated your consideration and welcome the opportunity to answer any questions needed to assist you in your decision to fund the North-South Connector Study.

Respectfully submitted,

EMEA Transportation Committee

By Steven J. Entenman, PE, SE
Chairman

Post Office Box 245



Troutdale, Oregon 97060

September 14, 2009

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Attn: Carlotta Collette, Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2739

The economic development of the East Metro area depends on a clear analysis of transportation needs of the area. Roads must have the capacity to handle current traffic demand and to adapt for the future.

The West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce supports the request by the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee to identify the I-84 to US 26 Corridor Refinement Plan as a regional priority in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan. We believe the Refinement Plan will provide the information necessary to identify appropriate transportation investments needed to foster economic growth and provide adequate statewide freight mobility.

Sincerely,

Eric C. Anderson
Interim Executive Director
West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce

Connecting Commerce and Communities to Create Economic Vitality

Phone: (503) 669-7473 • Fax: (503) 492-3613

info@westcolumbiagorgechamber.com • www.westcolumbiagorgechamber.com



August 10, 2009

Diane McKeel
County Commissioner
501 SE Hawthorne Blvd.
Suite 600
Portland, OR 97214

RE: Funding for the North South Connector Study

Dear Commissioner:

We are writing to urge your support for funding of the North South Connector Study.

Economic development and job creation in the east metro area of Multnomah and Clackamas County are at the core of this issue. The viability of industrial lands in the Columbia-Cascade River District, Springwater and Damascus are highly dependent on establishment of a viable north-south connector between Interstate 84 and US Highway 26. Funding of the North South Connector Study is the next crucial step in moving this important regional economic issue forward.

Without favorable funding action these industrial lands will remain dormant and this key component for future economic development in the region will remain untapped. Such a result would be detrimental to the region as a whole and erode the confidence of the citizens of the east metro area regarding their role in the future economic development of the region.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Unti", written over a horizontal line.

Dwight D. Unti
Chair
Governmental Affairs Council

Cc David Widmark, Gresham City Councilor
Carol Nielsen-Hood, CEO, Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce

Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Center

COLUMBIA CORRIDOR
A S S O C I A T I O N

28 August 2009

Councilor Carlotta Collette, Chair JPACT
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

re: Funding for the I-84 to US 26 corridor in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Chair Collette and JPACT Members,


The Columbia Corridor Association has had a longstanding interest in improving north-south connections in east Multnomah County. The lack of efficient connections to the south of the Columbia Corridor has increasingly become a disincentive for businesses to locate in places such as Rockwood Urban Renewal Area and the Reynolds Industrial site.

In the past, many businesses have refrained from involving themselves in the political disagreements that delayed action on a north-south corridor. But the east county cities are now in agreement, the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee (EMCTC) is requesting funding of a corridor plan, and Metro and JPACT support the idea of improving connectivity with a grid system throughout the region.


The Columbia Corridor Association supports the concept of multiple north-south corridors. We believe this is the most economical and agreeable solution for connections to the Columbia Corridor. We also believe this will bring some relief to the strained east-west corridors in east Multnomah County. It will also eventually help development of Damascus.

We ask that you support EMCTC's request to include a comprehensive study of the I-84 to US 26 corridor in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan.

Respectfully submitted,



Corky Collier
Executive Director



GRESHAM DOWNTOWN
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

August 27, 2009

Diane McKeel
County Commissioner
501 SE Hawthorne Blvd.
Suit 600
Portland, OR 97214

RE: Funding for the North South Connector Study

Dear Commissioner,

This letter shall serve as Gresham Downtown Development Association's (GDDA) support for funding of the North South Connector Study.

Economic development and job creation in the east metro area of Multnomah and Clackamas County are at the core of this issue. Continued economic growth within the Gresham Regional Center is greatly impacted by the lack of adequate connection between the Regional Center and it's neighboring communities to the North and South, as well as to Highway I-84, the region's key freight corridor. The viability of industrial lands in the Columbia-Cascade River District, Springwater and Damascus are also highly dependent on establishment of a viable north-south connector between Interstate 84 and US Highway 26, and beyond. Funding of the North South Connector Study is the next crucial step in moving this important regional economic issue forward.

Without favorable funding action, Gresham Regional Center's growth will continue to be stunted and the above industrial lands will remain dormant, a key component for future economic development in the region remaining untapped. Such a result would be detrimental to the region as a whole and erode the confidence of the citizens of the east metro area regarding their role in the future economic development of the region.

We see a great need for this Program and gladly partner with City staff to bring it to fruition.

Sincerely

Dan Pagano
Board President



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

John J. "Ski" Sygielski
President

503-491-7211 · Fax: 503-491-7498
john.ski@mhcc.edu

September 15, 2009

Ms. Carlotta Collette
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 N.E. Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2739

Dear Ms. Collette:

As the only institution of higher education in East Multnomah County serving over 30,000 individuals annually, Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) is very interested in working closely and collaboratively with the Cities of Fairview, Gresham, Troutdale, Wood Village, Multnomah County, the Oregon Department of Transportation and other regional partners to conduct a comprehensive transportation study in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding among the Cities dated April 26, 2007.

In an effort to attract and serve more students on our 200-acre Gresham campus, we have found that a lack of efficient connections to the south of the Columbia Corridor have increasingly become a deterrent for students and employers to take advantage of our many world-class training and education programs. In addition to making it more convenient for residents in our service region to participate in various programs and services available to our growing College community, an improved north-south transportation connection between I-84 and US 26 would foster the east regional industrial areas, including the Columbia-Cascade River District, Springwater and Damascus.

Therefore, the MHCC community asks you to support the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's request to include a comprehensive study of the I-84 to US 26 corridor in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan.

Sincerely,

John J. "Ski" Sygielski

be | your dream

Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations

ASERT *Centennial* Central City *Gresham Butte* Gresham Pleasant Valley
Hollybrook Kelly Creek *Mt. Hood* North Central *North Gresham*
Northeast *Northwest* Powell Valley *Rockwood* Southwest *Wilkes East*

September 9, 2009

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
ATTN: Carlotta Collette, Chair
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2739

RE: Support for East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's Request for Funding the I-84 to US26 Corridor Refinement Plan

The Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations supports a cooperative and holistic approach to planning and providing needed transportation in the east metro area. Improved transportation in the area is necessary to our economic viability and the livability for all communities involved. A comprehensive, independent and unbiased study of these needs is a first step in providing a forward-looking and connected transportation system in east metro. This study should evaluate multiple north-south as well as east-west corridors.

The Coalition therefore supports the East Multnomah County Transportation Committee's request to fund the I-84 to US26 Corridor Refinement Plan as a priority in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Carol Rulla
Coalition President
5162 SE 28th Dr.
Gresham, OR 97080

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.

STAFF 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 *de facto* 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.

RECOMMENDATION FROM TPAC:

TPAC recommended approval of the staff recommendation (**on a 7-2-2 vote**) as amended below (**on a 6-4-1 vote**):

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 *de facto* 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 all the

conditions are met, **including conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20;**

- 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.

In addition, TPAC considered two additional amendments which failed:

1. Revise Recommendation 2 d. as follows:

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~~ **then improvements east on Tonquin Road to Grahams Ferry Road, improvements on Grahams Ferry Road south to Day Road (Project #10588), improvements on Day Road east to Boones Ferry Road (Project #11243), and then improvements on Boones Ferry south to the North Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange (Project # 10852);** 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. **Failed on a 4-5-2 vote.**

2. Revise the Staff Recommendation by deleting Recommendations 2 b. and 2 c., thereby keeping right-of-way acquisition in the Financially Constrained component of the RTP (rather than removing it from the Financially Constrained component) in time period 2008-2017 (rather than moving it to time period 2018-2025). With this amendment, proceeding with right-of-way acquisition would still be subject to satisfying the conditions. **Failed on a 2-7-2 vote.**

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**

November 3, 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**

November 3, 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 all project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordinating with an <u>conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan Study including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20,</u> 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 all project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordinating with an <u>conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan Study including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20,</u> 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 all project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordinating with an <u>conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan Study including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20,</u> 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 all the project conditions are met: including integration with land use plans for UGB expansion areas and Urban Reserves, coordinating with an <u>conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan Study including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20,</u> 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	

MEMO

November 2, 2009

To: The Honorable Carlotta Collette, District 2 Councilor,
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

From: Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego,
Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City,
Alternate Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

RE: **Amendments for Draft 2035 RTP Pertaining to
Proposed I-5/99W Connector Route**

As representatives of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT, we seek to submit a set of amendments for consideration by JPACT for the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that pertains to the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route, "Discussion Item 5."

This memo relates to the Metro document entitled, "Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion Item 5; Updated 10/28/09; I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations: How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?" presented for TPAC consideration on Nov. 2, 2009, and MTAC consideration on Nov. 4, 2009.

Amendment #1 — Modify Recommendation #2.a on page 4 as follows

Add to Recommendation Item #2.a the following text in bold print:

"Include the conditions, **appended as Regional Transportation Plan Discussion Item #5 Attachment 1**, as part of the project description for the Southern Arterial with language that implementation will not proceed unless and until **all of** the conditions are met, **including conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan, which has been increased in scope by Metro to include Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20.**"

Amendment #2 — Modify Recommendation #2.d on pages 4-5 as follows

Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text in bold print and removing the following text with strike-out:

"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~~ **then improvements east on Tonquin Road to Grahams Ferry Road, improvements on Grahams Ferry Road south to Day Road (Project #10588), improvements on Day Road east to Boones Ferry Road (Project #11243), and then improvements on Boones Ferry then south to the North Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange (Project # 10852);** 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.”

Amendment #3 — Modify “RTP Discussion Item #5 - ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT 2035 RTP Project List / I-5/99W Connector Study Projects”

Modify the table list of projects to include those projects added in Amendment #2, including:

Project #10588: Grahams Ferry Rd. Improvements

Project #10852: 95th/Boones Ferry/Commerce Circle Intersection Improvements

Project #11243: Day Street

###

MEMO

November 5, 2009

To: The Honorable Carlotta Collette, District 2 Councilor,
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

From: Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego,
Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City,
Alternate Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

RE: **Modified Amendment for Draft 2035 RTP
Pertaining to Proposed I-5/99W Connector Route**

As representatives of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT, we seek to submit a modified amendment for consideration by JPACT for the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that pertains to the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route, "Discussion Item 5."

This memo supersedes and replaces our prior amendment memo dated Nov. 2, 2009. This new memo relates to the Metro document entitled, "Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion Item 5; Updated 11/03/09; I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations: How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?" presented for MTAC consideration on Nov. 4, 2009.

This new memo replaces the prior memo because the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) adopted on Nov. 2 Amendment #1 contained our Nov. 2 memo.

Proposed Amendment — Modify Recommendation #2.d on page 6

Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text in bold print:

"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 **utilizing existing right-of-way** 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."

###

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	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".	Bethany Wurtz	9/30/09	See Discussion item #5
11	Project	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>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
20	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.

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
21	Project	<p>Sunset the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Project by September 1, 2011</p> <p>Option 1 Add 5.4.2.7: Portland Central City to Vancouver (Mobility Corridor #1) (chapter 5, following p. 15) To a description of the CRC project in the corridor (to be drafted), add the following:</p> <p>"If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</p> <p>Option 2 Add the following language to section 5.7.1 (chapter 5, p. 20): "If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</p> <p>Option 3: Add the following footnote to the list of projects in Appendix 1 on the page that lists the CRC project: "If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</p>	Robert Liberty, Metro Councilor	11/2/09	This comment has been forwarded to the CRC Project Sponsors Council and JPACT for consideration on December 10.



Date: November 9, 2009
To: MPAC and interested parties
From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments – Consent Items (Exhibit G) –
RECOMMENDATION REQUESTED

Exhibit G (Consent Items for Consideration) is proposed for approval on a “consent” basis without further discussion on November 18.

Exhibit G includes proposed amendments to respond to public comments received between September 15 and October 15, 2009 and subsequent Metro advisory committee discussions, including the October 23 and October 28 MPAC meetings.

MTAC recommended MPAC approval of Exhibit G on November 4, 2009.

Exhibit G to Resolution No. 09-XXXX

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 formal 30-day public comment period. This section includes changes that are recommended for approval as a package of consent items without further discussion. On November 4, 2009, the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) recommended approval of the recommendations as a package of consent items without further discussion. The Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) will make a recommendation on November 20, 2009.

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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 transportation needs include:</u></p> <p><u>Southbound truck climbing Lanes from Willamette River to 10th St. interchange, over \$20 million; Interchange improvements at locations including: Division/Powell, Airport Way, OR 213, OR 212/224, Sunrise, Johnson Creek Boulevard and others, totaling over \$250 million; Auxiliary lanes, northbound and southbound in the following locations: Airport Way to Columbia Blvd., Columbia Blvd. to I-84, I-84 to Glisan, Glisan to Division/Powell, Division/Powell to Foster, Foster to Johnson Creek Boulevard, OR 212/224 to Gladstone, Gladstone to OR 99E, averaging \$20 million each; totaling over \$200 million; Widen to 6 lanes from Stafford Interchange to Willamette River, over \$40 million; Widen Abernethy Bridge to 6 lanes plus auxiliary lanes, over \$100 million; Improvements needed on OR 213 (82nd. Avenue) include bicycle/pedestrian and streetscape improvements, totaling over \$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.
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.
8	Corridor refinement plans	<p>Add the following potential solutions to be considered in the corridor refinement plan description for Mobility Corridor 24, including TV Highway: <u>Transportation System Management – signal interconnects – from Beaverton to Aloha and Aloha to Hillsboro, over \$4 million; transit service improvements to provide frequent bus service.</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.
9	Corridor refinement plans	<p>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.</p>	ODOT	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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: "Oregon Shipments for Top-Tier Commodities, by Weight and Value for 2002 and 2035"	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 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 managing congestion".
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 also target non-commute trips during rush hour and throughout the day as a key strategy to congestion and air quality issues.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.”
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. As reported on the federal websites, <u>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: “ <u>For example, though 90 percent of total regional truck trips begin and/or end within our region, as much as 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> ”

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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: " <u>Vehicle C</u> ongestion during peak hours adversely impacts these truck movements. Intermittent rail congestion <u>also impacts the from movements required as</u> Class 1 and shortline railroads <u>that provide connections to access</u> the 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, i</u> ndustrial sanctuaries should continue to be considered a unique and protected land use."
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
34	Finance	Expand funding sources discussion to more clearly show the sources of funding assumed for each coordinating committee target.	City of Milwaukee	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
35	Finance	Raising all system development charges to a regional average may not be legal.	City of Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee	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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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> "
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 freight plan.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 -- managing adverse...</u> "
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..."

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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</u> to develop a regional freight plan	Metro Staff	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
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: " <u>Engaging stakeholders</u> 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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
98	HCT plan	<p>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):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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), Boston "T" (0.336), Atlanta MARTA (0.265) and the national average for heavy rail systems (0.239) • TriMet MAX is efficient in energy use: 0.0979 KWH per seat mile compared to national average of 0.1274 for light rail. It is even slightly better than the national average for heavy rail systems (0.109); • TriMet bus service system wide emits less carbon: 0.584 pounds CO2 per passenger mile, compared to national average of 0.65. • TriMet bus service system wide is efficient in energy use: 0.126 pounds CO2 per seat mile, compared to national average of 0.154. 	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 Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee LRT and Vancouver LRT.	City of Milwaukee	10/14/09	Amend as requested. Milwaukee LRT and Vancouver LRT data will be added
102	HCT plan	Page 40 - Clarify whether Figure 3.7 includes operation cost only.	City of Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee	10/14/09	Amend as requested.
104	HCT plan	Page 44 - Figure 3.11 - include similar data if available for Portland to Milwaukee LRT and Vancouver LRT.	City of Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee	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 Milwaukee	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	TPAC discussed this item on November 2 and recommended adding the following clarifying language: <u>In some cases the System Expansion Policy (SEP) and corridor refinement plan prioritization factors may overlap, however, application of the SEP and Corridor Refinement Plan prioritization factors will occur through separate processes.</u> 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 logical functional segment.
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	The following revised language was recommended by TPAC on Nov. 2 and MTAC on Nov. 4. Amend page 7, Chapter 5 to add the following language, "Individual project and program solutions identified in the RTP may move forward to project development at the discretion of the facility owner/operator. 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." In addition, revise the text box on page 6 as follows, "MOU or IGA to implement mobility corridor strategy or refinement plan recommendation or HCT system expansion targets...(in advance of project development)." 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.
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.
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. Amend as requested per Discussion item #2. This revised language was recommended by TPAC on Nov. 2 and MTAC on Nov. 4.
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 <u>and bike</u> 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 6 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	The following revised language was recommended by TPAC on Oct. 30 and MTAC on Nov. 4.: "...at a minimum of least every 530 ft - though an ideal spacing in the range of is 200 to 400 feet where possible is preferred ..." The language does not amend current regional connectivity standards, but does highlight that more frequent intersection spacing is ideal to support walking, bicycling and access to transit.
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 ...increase awareness <u>and use</u> of travel options.
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 bicylists.	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	The following revised language was recommended by TPAC on Nov. 2 and MTAC on Nov. 4. Amend as requested. The language will be changed to reflect that 18% 25% of the projects are focused solely on the bicycle and/or pedestrian systems. 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	This comment and recommendation was moved to be discussion item #20 in Exhibit F. 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 maintaining 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 if 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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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 completing a Carbon Analysis/Reduction Study (the first within the State of Oregon).
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.
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	The following revised language was recommended by TPAC on Nov. 2 and MTAC on Nov. 4. Staff is working on this and bring a consolidated schedule and more detailed summary of tasks to be completed for consideration. No change needed. The region intends to implement the Regional Freight Plan in such a way as to retain companies like Sun-Microsystems.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 <u>and easily identifiable</u> passenger infrastructure, including waiting areas that are weather protected. Additional passenger amenities at stops <u>may</u> 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,</u> providing corridor service rather than nodal service along selected arterial streets. This service typically runs at least every 15-10- 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.

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 <u>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, with stops spaced every 750 to 1000 feet. 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.</u></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 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. This network includes local bus, para-transit, streetcar, and tram.</u>"</p>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.

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> . Stops are generally spaced every 750 to 1000 feet. Transit preferential treatments and passenger infrastructure such as bus shelters, special lighting, transit signal priority and curb extensions are appropriate at <u>some locations 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.

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 <u>real-time schedule information</u> , 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.
347	Existing conditions	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." 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.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested to provide additional supporting evidence.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
348	Existing conditions	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.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
349	Existing conditions	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>	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
350	Existing conditions	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.	TriMet	10/15/09	Amend as requested.
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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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 be <u>designed and constructed in such a manner as to not be a barrier support to bicycling, or walking 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.
356	Policy	Pg. 30: The first policy "Build a well-connected network of complete streets" does not fully capture the need. Add the following: " <u>...that prioritize safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access.</u> "	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.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
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.

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	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.	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.
363	Policy	Amend Objective 4.4 Demand Management as follows: "Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to <u>dramatically</u> increase awareness of travel options walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling."	TriMet	10/28/09	Amend as discussed and recommended by TPAC on November 2 and MTAC on November 4: "Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to <u>dramatically</u> increase awareness of travel options <u>telecommuting, walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling, and shift travel to off-peak periods.</u> "
364	Policy	"Objective 4.5 Value Pricing – Consider and selectively Promote as appropriate a broader application of value pricing as a potential management tool."	TriMet	10/28/09	MTAC recommended approval of the language as proposed on Nov. 4. ODOT and TriMet staff may bring updated language to MPAC on November 18 and TPAC on November 20 for further consideration.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
365	Policy	Add a paragraph to Chapter 2, on Page 32 just before Figure 2.11 as follows, "Research and experience have shown that there are <u>optimal street designs for various types of roadways: 2-lane for local streets and collectors, 4-lane for arterials and 6-lane for throughways. Therefore, before adding additional through lanes beyond this optimal configuration, projects must demonstrate that the additional lanes do not compromise the function of the roadway for all modes and that alternative investments are unavailable to address capacity concerns.</u> "	Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor	11/3/09	MTAC recommended approval of the following language on Nov. 4. TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20. Amend as follows, " <u>Research and experience have shown that there are optimal street designs for various types of roadways. 2-lane for local streets and collectors, 4-lane for arterials and 6-lane for throughways. Local streets and collectors are planned to consist of 2-lanes with turn lanes, major arterials are planned to consist of 4-lanes with turn lanes, minor arterials are planned to consist of 2-lanes with turn lanes and throughways are planned to consist of 6-lanes plus auxiliary lanes with grade separated interchanges or intersections. Therefore, before adding additional through lanes beyond this optimal configuration, the planned system, projects plans and studies must demonstrate that the additional lanes beyond the planned system do not compromise the function of the roadway for all modes and that alternative investments are unavailable- the planned system of through lanes, transit service, bike, pedestrian and other parallel arterial, operational, system and demand management solutions do not adequately address transportation needs first, prior to considering widening beyond the planned system to address capacity concerns.</u> " This language more clearly defines the planned system as required by the transportation planning rule, per comment #126, and the circumstances under which projects may be identified that go beyond the planned system to address identified needs. This language also better links the RTP to federally-required congestion management process and Policy 1G, Major Improvements, of the Oregon Highway Plan.

CONSENT ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

#	Category	Comment	Source	Date	Recommendation
366	Policy	<p>Amendment: Link transportation investments to increased diversity of housing</p> <p>Option 1 Revise Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8):</p> <p>“Support the preservation and production of affordable housing in the region by giving higher priority to transportation investments for the benefit of those local governments taking measures to increase housing choice for income groups with very limited choices of housing within the jurisdiction.”</p> <p>Option 2 Add Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8):</p> <p>“Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity.”</p> <p>Option 3 Add Objective 8.3 to Goal 8: Ensure Equity (p. 11):</p> <p>“Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity.”</p>	Robert Liberty, Metro Councilor	11/2/09	<p>MTAC recommended Option 3 on Nov. 4. TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20. Amend as requested in Option 3. Add Objective 8.3 to Goal 8: Ensure Equity (p. 11): <u>“Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity.”</u> In addition, add a new Objective 8.4 to Goal 8 that states, <u>“Reduce the share of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of household income on housing and transportation combined.”</u> Combined these two objectives will support the region’s efforts to better link transportation investments to increased housing diversity and providing affordable housing and transportation options for everyone.</p>
367	Project	<p>Revise the description of the Sunnybrook Road extension, project # 10019, be modified to add the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design the street as a local access connector. • Apply a “practical design” approach. • Include green street elements in the final design of the project. • Minimize environmental impacts of the new street connection during future planning, engineering and construction phases. 	Carlotta Collette, Metro Councilor	11/5/09	<p>Amend as requested. Note:MTAC did not take action on this recommendation as the amendment was provided after the 11/4/09 MTAC action on Exhibit G. TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20.</p>



Date: November 9, 2009

To: MPAC, Metro Council and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: Regional Transportation Plan Amendments Proposed by JPACT and MPAC Members

This memo summarizes RTP amendments proposed by MPAC and JPACT members. The proposed amendments are attached for reference.

Unless otherwise noted, TPAC and MTAC recommend approval of the recommendation as presented below. The comments and recommendations have been incorporated in Exhibit F and G.

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
1 (Exhibit G, comment #364)	<p><i>Amend Objective 4.5 Value Pricing as follows:</i> “Objective 4.5 Value Pricing – Consider and selectively Promote as appropriate a broader application of value pricing as a potential management tool.”</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>Rick Van Beveren, TriMet, 10/28/09</p>	<p>On Nov. 4, MTAC recommended approval of the language as proposed. ODOT and TriMet staff may bring updated language to MPAC on November 18 and TPAC on November 20 for further consideration.</p>
2 (Exhibit G, comment #363)	<p><i>Amend Objective 4.4 Demand Management as follows:</i> “Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to <u>dramatically increase awareness of travel options walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling.</u>”</p> <p><i>It's not just awareness but actual <u>use</u> of other modes that matters.</i></p>	<p>Rick Van Beveren, TriMet, 10/28/09</p>	<p>Amend as discussed and recommended by TPAC on Nov. 2 and MTAC on Nov. 4: “Objective 4.4 Demand management – Implement services, incentives and supportive infrastructure to <u>dramatically increase awareness of travel options telecommuting, walking, biking, taking transit, and carpooling, and shift travel to off-peak periods.</u>”</p>
3 (Exhibit F, discussion item #2)	<p><i>Amend 2.3.1 Performance Targets section, Table 2.3 as follows:</i> “Active transportation – By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit <u>trips-mode share</u> compared to 2005.”</p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>Rick Van Beveren, TriMet, 10/28/09</p>	<p>TPAC and MTAC recommended approval of the language on Nov. 2 and Nov. 4, respectively.</p>

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
<p>4</p> <p>(Exhibit F, discussion item #5)</p>	<p>Discussion Item #5: Modify Recommendation #2.a on page 4 as follows</p> <p>Add to Recommendation Item #2.a the following text in bold print:</p> <p>"Include the conditions, appended as Regional Transportation Plan Discussion Item #5 Attachment 1, as part of the project description for the Southern Arterial with language that implementation will not proceed unless and until <u>all of the conditions are met, including conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan, which has been increased in scope by Metro to include Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20.</u>"</p>	<p>Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego and Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City</p> <p>11/2/09</p>	<p>Amend as requested. This change is reflected in November 2 TPAC recommendation to JPACT and November 4 MTAC recommendation for MPAC for Discussion item #5.</p>
<p>5</p> <p>(Exhibit F, discussion item #5)</p>	<p>Discussion Item #5: Modify Recommendation #2.d on pages 4-5 as follows:</p> <p>Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text in bold print and removing the following text with strike-out:</p> <p>"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 then improvements east on Tonquin Road to Grahams Ferry Road, improvements on Grahams Ferry Road south to Day Road (Project #10588), improvements on Day Road east to Boones Ferry Road (Project #11243), and then improvements on Boones Ferry then south to the North Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange (Project # 10852); 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."</p>	<p>Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego and Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City</p> <p>11/2/09</p>	<p>No change recommended. TPAC and MTAC considered and did not recommend this amendment as described in the November 2 TPAC recommendation to JPACT and November 4 MTAC recommendation for MPAC for Discussion item #5.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>(Exhibit F, discussion item #5)</p>	<p>Amendment #3 — Modify "RTP Discussion Item #5 - ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT 2035 RTP Project List / I-5/99W Connector Study Projects"</p> <p>Modify the table list of projects to include those projects added in Amendment #2, including:</p> <p>Project #10588: Grahams Ferry Rd. Improvements Project #10852: 95th/Boones Ferry/Commerce Circle Intersection Improvements Project #11243: Day Street</p>	<p>Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego and Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City</p> <p>11/2/09</p>	<p>No change recommended. TPAC and MTAC considered and did not recommend this amendment as described in the November 2 TPAC recommendation to JPACT and November 4 MTAC recommendation for MPAC for Discussion item #5.</p>

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
<p>7</p> <p>(Exhibit G, comment #365)</p>	<p>Add a paragraph to Chapter 2, on Page 32 just before Figure 2.11</p> <p><u>"Research and experience have shown that there are optimal street designs for various types of roadways: 2-lane for local streets and collectors, 4-lane for arterials and 6-lane for throughways. Therefore, before adding additional through lanes beyond this optimal configuration, projects must demonstrate that the additional lanes do not compromise the function of the roadway for all modes and that alternative investments are unavailable to address capacity concerns."</u></p>	<p>Rex Burkholder, Metro Council</p> <p>11/3/09</p>	<p>MTAC recommended approval of the following language on Nov. 4. TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20. <u>"Research and experience have shown that there are optimal street designs for various types of roadways. 2-lane for local streets and collectors, 4-lane for arterials and 6-lane for throughways. Local streets and collectors are planned to consist of 2-lanes with turn lanes, major arterials are planned to consist of 4-lanes with turn lanes, minor arterials are planned to consist of 2-lanes with turn lanes and throughways are planned to consist of 6-lanes plus auxiliary lanes with grade separated interchanges or intersections. Therefore, before adding additional through lanes beyond this optimal configuration, the planned system, projects plans and studies must demonstrate that the additional lanes beyond the planned system do not compromise the function of the roadway for all modes and that alternative investments are unavailable the planned system of through lanes, transit service, bike, pedestrian and other parallel arterial, operational, system and demand management solutions do not adequately address transportation needs first, prior to considering widening beyond the planned system to address capacity concerns."</u> This language more clearly defines the planned system as required by the transportation planning rule, per comment #126, and the circumstances under which projects may be identified that go beyond the planned system to address identified needs. This language also better links the RTP to federally-required congestion management process and Policy 1G, Major Improvements, of the Oregon Highway Plan.</p>
<p>8</p> <p>(Exhibit G, comment #366)</p>	<p>Amendment: Link transportation investments to increased diversity of housing</p> <p><i>Option 1</i></p> <p>Revise Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8): <u>"Support the preservation and production of affordable housing in the region by giving higher priority to transportation investments for the benefit of those local governments taking measures to increase housing choice for income groups with very limited</u></p>	<p>Robert Liberty, Metro Councilor</p> <p>11/2/09</p>	<p>MTAC recommended Option 3 on Nov. 4. In addition, add a new Objective 8.4 to Goal 8 that states, <u>"Reduce the share of households in the region spending more than 50 percent of household income on housing and transportation combined."</u></p> <p>Combined these two objectives will support the region's efforts to better link transportation investments to increased</p>

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
	<p><u>choices of housing within the jurisdiction.</u></p> <p><i>Option 2</i></p> <p>Add Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8): "Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity."</p> <p><i>Option 3</i></p> <p>Add Objective 8.3 to Goal 8: Ensure Equity (p. 11): "Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity."</p>		<p>housing diversity and providing affordable housing and transportation options for everyone.</p> <p><i>TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20.</i></p>

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
<p>9</p> <p>(Exhibit F, discussion item)</p>	<p>Sunset the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Project by September 1, 2011</p> <p><i>Option 1</i> Add 5.4.2.7: Portland Central City to Vancouver (Mobility Corridor #1) (chapter 5, following p. 15) To a description of the CRC project in the corridor (to be drafted), add the following:</p> <p><u>"If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</u></p> <p><i>Option 2</i> Add the following language to section 5.7.1 (chapter 5, p. 20): <u>"If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</u></p> <p><i>Option 3:</i> Add the following footnote to the list of projects in Appendix 1 on the page that lists the CRC project: <u>"If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor."</u></p>	<p>Robert Liberty, Metro Councilor</p> <p>11/2/09</p>	<p>This comment has been forwarded to the CRC Project Sponsors Council and JPACT for consideration on December 10.</p>

#	Comment	Source	Recommendation
10 (Exhibit G, comment #367)	Revise the description of the Sunnybrook Road extension, project # 10019, be modified to add the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design the street as a local access connector. • Apply a "practical design" approach. • Include green street elements in the final design of the project. • Minimize environmental impacts of the new street connection during future planning, engineering and construction phases. 	Carlotta Collette, Metro Councilor 11/5/09	Amend as requested. <i>Note: MTAC did not take action on this recommendation as the amendment was provided after the 11/4/09 MTAC action on Exhibit G. TPAC will make a recommendation on November 20.</i>
11 (Exhibit F, comment #20)	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.	Roy Rogers, 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.
12 (Exhibit F, discussion item #5)	Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text as shown in bold and underline below: "d. Modify the description of the SW 124 th extension to reflect a 2-3 lane project (Project #10736) from SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road to the vicinity of SW Tonquin Road, then <u>utilizing existing right-of-way</u> east to SW Boones Ferry Road, then south to 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."	Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego and Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City 11/5/09	This amendment has been forwarded to JPACT and MPAC for consideration.

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.*

MEMO

November 2, 2009

To: The Honorable Carlotta Collette, District 2 Councilor,
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

From: Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego,
Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City,
Alternate Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

RE: **Amendments for Draft 2035 RTP Pertaining to
Proposed I-5/99W Connector Route**

As representatives of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT, we seek to submit a set of amendments for consideration by JPACT for the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that pertains to the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route, "Discussion Item 5."

This memo relates to the Metro document entitled, "Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion Item 5; Updated 10/28/09; I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations: How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?" presented for TPAC consideration on Nov. 2, 2009, and MTAC consideration on Nov. 4, 2009.

Amendment #1 — Modify Recommendation #2.a on page 4 as follows

Add to Recommendation Item #2.a the following text in bold print:

"Include the conditions, **appended as Regional Transportation Plan Discussion Item #5 Attachment 1**, as part of the project description for the Southern Arterial with language that implementation will not proceed unless and until **all of** the conditions are met, **including conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan, which has been increased in scope by Metro to include Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20.**"

Amendment #2 — Modify Recommendation #2.d on pages 4-5 as follows

Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text in bold print and removing the following text with strike-out:

"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~~ **then improvements east on Tonquin Road to Grahams Ferry Road, improvements on Grahams Ferry Road south to Day Road (Project #10588), improvements on Day Road east to Boones Ferry Road (Project #11243), and then improvements on Boones Ferry then south to the North Wilsonville/I-5 Interchange (Project # 10852);** 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.”

Amendment #3 — Modify “RTP Discussion Item #5 - ATTACHMENT 2: DRAFT 2035 RTP Project List / I-5/99W Connector Study Projects”

Modify the table list of projects to include those projects added in Amendment #2, including:

Project #10588: Grahams Ferry Rd. Improvements

Project #10852: 95th/Boones Ferry/Commerce Circle Intersection Improvements

Project #11243: Day Street

###

November 2, 2009

Tom Brian, Chair
Metro Policy Advisory Committee

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

(transmitted via email)

Dear Chair Brian and Chair Collette:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The substance of these amendments has been discussed at many of the advisory committee meetings and I offer these amendments with various options, in draft form, open to further modification.

1. Amendment: Link transportation investments to increased diversity of housing

Option 1

Revise Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8):

“Support the preservation and production of affordable housing in the region **by giving higher priority to transportation investments for the benefit of those local governments taking measures to increase housing choice for income groups with very limited choices of housing within the jurisdiction.**”

Option 2

Add Objective 1.4 to Goal 1: Foster Vibrant Communities and Efficient Urban Form (chapter 2, p. 8):

“Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity.”

Option 3

Add Objective 8.3 to Goal 8: Ensure Equity (p. 11):

“Use transportation investments to achieve greater diversity of housing opportunities by linking investments to measures taken by the local governments to increase housing diversity.”

2. Sunset the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) Project by September 1, 2011

Option 1

Add 5.4.2.7: Portland Central City to Vancouver (Mobility Corridor #1) (chapter 5, following p. 15)

To a description of the CRC project in the corridor (to be drafted), add the following:

“If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor.”

Option 2

Add the following language to section 5.7.1 (chapter 5, p. 20):

“If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor.”

Option 3: Add the following footnote to the list of projects in Appendix 1 on the page that lists the CRC project:

“If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor.”

3. Housing Affordability Performance Measure

In addition to these two areas, I also support an additional amendment that revises the RTP performance target for housing/transportation cost burden per household. The revised performance measure would call for a reduction of the share of households in the region that spend more than 50% of income on housing and transportation combined. I understand that this specific issue was raised in MTAC and MPAC and an amendment has already been developed that is consistent with this policy.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to submit these amendments to the RTP.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Liberty", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Robert Liberty

cc: Kim Ellis, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Metro Council, Mara Gross



COUNCILOR REX BURKHOLDER, DISTRICT 5

November 3, 2009

Tom Brian, Chair
Metro Policy Advisory Committee

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

(transmitted via email)

Dear Chair Brian and Chair Collette:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). I have one amendment of substance to submit.

1. Amendment: Add a paragraph to Chapter 2, on Page 32 just before Figure 2.11

“Research and experience have shown that there are optimal street designs for various types of roadways: 2-lane for local streets and collectors, 4-lane for arterials and 6-lane for throughways. Therefore, before adding additional through lanes beyond this optimal configuration, projects must demonstrate that the additional lanes do not compromise the function of the roadway for all modes and that alternative investments are unavailable to address capacity concerns.”

Again, thank you for the opportunity to submit these amendments to the RTP.

Sincerely,

Rex Burkholder
District 5

cc: Kim Ellis, Robin McArthur, Kelsey Newell, Metro Council



COUNCILOR CARLOTTA COLLETTE, DISTRICT 2

November 5, 2009

Tom Brian, Chair
Metro Policy Advisory Committee

Kathryn Harrington, Vice Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

(Transmitted via email)

Dear Chair Brian and Vice Chair Harrington:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The following amendment relates to the Sunnybrook Road extension project in Clackamas County. I propose that the description of the Sunnybrook Road extension, project # 10019, be modified to add the following conditions:

- Design the street as a local access connector.
- Apply a “practical design” approach.
- Include green street elements in the final design of the project.
- Minimize environmental impacts of the new street connection during future planning, engineering and construction phases.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to submit this amendment to the RTP.


Sincerely,

Carlotta Collette

cc: Chair Lynn Peterson, Kim Ellis, Robin McArthur, Metro Council, Kelsey Newell



October 5, 2009



Carlotta Collette, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Or 97232-2736

Dear Chair Collette,

Our preliminary review of the public review draft of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan indicates one major issue that needs to be resolved prior to finalizing the plan.

Given the public comment period deadline for RTP comments relative to WCCC meeting dates, we anticipate this being the only comment you will receive from the WCCC on the RTP at this time. However, we anticipate that you will receive individual comments from the County and cities within the County.

At this time, we ask for the following amendments to the state RTP:

- a) Add a six-lane Hwy 217 to the RTP investment strategy (Appendix 1). We believe the cost for the project is approximately \$600 million. We would welcome the opportunity to work with Metro and ODOT to confirm that this is the latest and best estimate. The project would not be considered a federal priority and would only show up on "the state list".
- b) Amend Chapter 3 as appropriate to add \$600 million to the assumptions for the revenue pool. The current total of the revenue pool is \$20.9 billion. Our recommended addition would be less than 3%.

We believe there have been a variety of previous decisions, promises and commitments that warrant these changes. The specific reasons for requesting this modification are:

- A 3-lane section in each direction on Hwy 217 has been identified as a need in Washington County's adopted and acknowledged transportation plan since 1988.
- Thousands of land use decisions have been made in the County since 1988. These investment and land use decisions were premised on various commitments made in the comprehensive plan, including the principle that Hwy 217 would ultimately be expanded to 3 lanes in each direction.
- In the late 90's, after several years of rigorous and costly analysis, the Western Bypass study concluded that the Western Bypass was not needed as long as a series of other transportation improvements were made. This conclusion was

Board of County Commissioners

155 North First Avenue, Suite 300, MS 22, Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072
phone: (503) 846-8681 • fax: (503) 846-4545

based largely on the notion that a 3-lane Hwy. 217 in each direction would provide the needed capacity.


- A 3 lane in each direction Hwy. 217 is currently part of Metro's adopted and acknowledged RTP (project 3000).
- In 2005, Metro staff with the assistance of a policy advisory committee (PAC) that included elected officials, business interests and residents, completed the *Highway 217 Corridor Study*. In February 2006, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 06-3658 and Exhibit A to that resolution, which contains a PAC recommendation that the general purpose and express toll lane options be carried forward into a Hwy. 217 EIS that would further evaluate these improvements. The resolution also approved a PAC recommendation that funding should be sought to commence a corridor study of I-5 between Hwy. 217 and Wilsonville. In the 2009 draft RTP, Metro has rightly reduced the number of future corridor studies. The logic in doing so is sound only if the results of the previous corridor studies, such as the one for Hwy. 217, are folded into the RTP.
- Decreasing the planned capacity of Hwy 217 is inconsistent with ODOT's, Metro's and the County's performance standards.
- County staff believe the RTP is a plan amendment subject to OAR 660-012-0060 of the Transportation Planning Rule. Changing the planned capacity of Hwy 217 is subject to findings under this OAR.
- Decreasing the planned capacity of Hwy. 217 will result in additional traffic on parallel facilities. To accommodate this traffic, roadways will need to be widened. Many of these roadways traverse through centers such as the Washington Square Regional Center and the Beaverton Regional Center. The projects we have submitted for the 2035 State RTP are primarily based upon current transportation plans which assume that Hwy. 217 will be widened to six lanes. If this assumption is incorrect, then we will need to submit additional or expanded projects to accommodate the shifted travel demand and meet our local adopted performance measures. The ability to make these locations transit, bike and pedestrian friendly is already a challenge. Adding more regional traffic will make this challenge even more difficult
- OAR 660-012-0015 (2)(a) is clear that regional TSPs shall establish a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified regional transportation needs . It is not enough to merely vaguely identify Hwy. 217 as a need as part of a mobility corridor. The need has to have a corresponding project, which, in this case, is a six-lane Hwy 217.
- A six-lane Hwy 217 is consistent with the throughway concept in the draft RTP. See page 32 – "...throughways are typically six-lane facilities that serve as the workhorse for regional, statewide and interstate travel...". A six-lane Hwy 217

would seem to be consistent with Metro's vision of "building a well-connected network of complete streets", since a complete throughway is six lanes.

- As we pointed out in our August letter to JPACT, we believe that developing the State RTP based on constrained revenue targets is unwise and leaves many needs unaddressed. Constraining project needs by highly uncertain revenue projections suggests that there are no needs beyond things we think we will be able to pay for far into the future. We don't believe this level of rigorous constraint in defining needs is required under administrative rules that guide development of the RTP.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Roy R. Rogers".

Roy Rogers, Chair
Washington County Coordinating Committee

Cc Kathryn Harrington, Metro Councilor
Andy Cotugno, Metro Policy Advisor
Josh Naramore, Metro Transportation Planner
Kathy Lehtola, Director, Land Use and Transportation

MEMO

November 5, 2009

To: The Honorable Carlotta Collette, District 2 Councilor,
Chair, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

From: Donna Jordan, Councilor, City of Lake Oswego,
Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

Alice Norris, Mayor, City of Oregon City,
Alternate Representative of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT

RE: **Modified Amendment for Draft 2035 RTP
Pertaining to Proposed I-5/99W Connector Route**

As representatives of the Cities of Clackamas County to JPACT, we seek to submit a modified amendment for consideration by JPACT for the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that pertains to the proposed I-5/99W Connector Route, "Discussion Item 5."

This memo supersedes and replaces our prior amendment memo dated Nov. 2, 2009. This new memo relates to the Metro document entitled, "Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion Item 5; Updated 11/03/09; I-5/99W Connector Study Area – Issues, Options and Recommendations: How should the I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations be reflected in the RTP?" presented for MTAC consideration on Nov. 4, 2009.

This new memo replaces the prior memo because the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) adopted on Nov. 2 Amendment #1 contained our Nov. 2 memo.

Proposed Amendment — Modify Recommendation #2.d on page 6

Modify Recommendation #2.d by adding the following text in bold print:

"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 **utilizing existing right-of-way** 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."

###

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 09-XXXX FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE DRAFT 2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN, WITH THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS, FOR FINAL REVIEW AND ANALYSIS FOR AIR QUALITY CONFORMANCE: THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS ACTION PLAN; THE REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN; THE HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM PLAN; AND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN

Date: November 6, 2009

Prepared by: Kim Ellis, 503-797-1617

BACKGROUND

Metro is the regional government responsible for regional land use and transportation planning under state law and the federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Portland metropolitan area. As the federally-designated MPO, Metro is responsible for updating the RTP every four years, which includes updating goals and policies to guide transportation investments, and compiling a financially constrained list of projects and programs to meet requirements for federal funding. Metro is also responsible for developing a regional transportation system plan (TSP), consistent with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements.

Metro's jurisdictional boundary encompasses the urban portions of Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas counties. Metro's planning partners include the 25 cities, three counties and affected special districts of the region, ODOT, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Port of Portland, South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART), TriMet and other interested community, business and advocacy groups as well as state and federal regulatory agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Metro also coordinates with the City of Vancouver, Clark County Washington, the Port of Vancouver, the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), C-Tran, the Washington Department of Transportation, the Southwest Washington Air Pollution Control Authority and other Clark County governments on bi-state issues. The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council is the federally designated MPO for the Clark County portion of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region.

2035 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The 2035 RTP represents the first significant update to the plan since 2000. The Metro Council initiated the 2035 RTP Update on September 22, 2005 with approval of Resolution No. 05-3610A (for the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the "Budgeting for Outcomes" Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities).

The update involved a new approach that included:

- (1) A strong education component to increase community and stakeholder awareness of the issues facing the region, including a growing population, climate change and economic instability.
- (2) An outcomes-based approach linked to public values to assess 2040 implementation and to evaluate and prioritize transportation investments. This approach more fully integrated land use, economic, environmental and transportation objectives in the decision-making process. 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 drive alone trips, vehicle miles traveled and corresponding GHG

emissions. The RTP includes specific performance targets and indicators that we will monitor over time, using this information to determine whether future adjustments to policies and strategies are needed.

- (3) Collaboration with regional partners and key stakeholders to resolve the complex issues inherent in realizing the region's 2040 Growth Concept.

The 2035 RTP plan updates the policies, projects and strategies for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and meeting the statewide greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets at the regional and local levels. By 2035, the metro region and surrounding counties are expected to have grown by more than 1 million people and added more than 500,000 jobs, doubling trips on the transportation system.

Through its policies, projects and strategies, the 2035 RTP aims to:

- support the region's vision to use land inside the UGB as efficiently as possible to reduce the need for costly new infrastructure and protect farm and forest lands
- attract jobs and housing to downtowns, main streets and employment areas
- increase safety for all transportation system users
- increase the use of public transit and reduce travel distances and the need to travel by car to help reduce air pollution and our carbon footprint
- complete gaps in existing roads, bridges, transit service, sidewalks and bike facilities
- improve interchanges and more capacity in the region's highway system
- build trails and other connections to make it safer and more convenient to walk and bike
- use technology to make travel safer, more efficient and reliable for cars, trucks and transit

All of these strategies and investments will help the region make the most out of what we have, comprehensively address growing congestion and make travel more convenient and affordable and reliable for everyone – including businesses and freight shippers. They will also provide real options for walking, biking and using transit and help the region's businesses and industry create and retain jobs and remain competitive

The following outcomes provided the framework for the updated policies, projects and strategies:

Desired outcomes for a successful region

1. People live and work in vibrant communities where they can choose to walk for pleasure and to meet everyday needs.
2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
3. People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
4. The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
5. Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
6. The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

SUMMARY OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Metro's transportation planning activities are guided by a federally mandated decision-making framework, called the metropolitan transportation planning process. Metro leads this process in consultation and coordination with federal, state, regional and local governments, and engagement of other stakeholders with an interest in or who are affected by this planning effort. Metro facilitates this

consultation and coordination through four advisory committee bodies—the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

The 2035 RTP update process relied on this existing decision-making structure for development, review and adoption of the plan. MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council made recommendations at key decision points based on input from TPAC, MTAC, the Council-appointed Regional Freight Plan Task Force and the public participation process.

Technical work groups were formed to advise Metro staff on the development of work products throughout the process. Metro technical staff also worked with the Regional Travel Options Subcommittee to TPAC, the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Subcommittee to TPAC and the Regional Trails Working Group throughout the update process. The Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement provided advice on public engagement activities.

THE 2035 RTP UPDATE PROCESS AND DECISION TIMETABLE

Metro began the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan update in fall 2005, with early scoping that involved regional partners, community organizations and other stakeholders. Work from fall 2006 through fall 2007 included considerable stakeholder and public involvement to determine needs and develop policies that provided a framework to guide updating the RTP. In December 2007, the Metro Council adopted the federal component of the 2035 RTP to meet planning requirements in the most recent transportation authorization act, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The U.S. Department of Transportation approved the federal component of the 2035 RTP on March 5, 2008.

Following approval of the federal RTP, staff turned to completing a final RTP to meet regional and state land use goals and the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule. 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.

During 2008 and 2009, RTP work focused on framing and refining transportation and land-use choices as part of the broader *Making the Greatest Place* effort. This comprehensive effort seeks to integrate local and regional land use and transportation investments to focus future population and employment growth in centers, corridors, and employment areas, consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept. This work included the evaluation of different land-use and transportation investment scenarios.

Metro also convened a bicycle work group to identify policy refinements to respond to public comments received during the federal component of the RTP update and to incorporate active transportation policy recommendations identified by the Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails. Metro will develop other policy refinements in the draft plan to further implement policy direction from the HCT, TSMO and Freight Plans and policy direction from JPACT and MPAC on performance targets.

At the same time, Metro and its regional partners continued to work on related planning efforts that will be included in the RTP: the Sunrise Corridor project, the I-5/99W connector study, the Sellwood Bridge study, the high-capacity transit (HCT) system plan, the regional freight plan and the Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan. Metro also worked with communities around the region to identify their local land use, transportation and public infrastructure-related aspirations for managing growth and the investments needed to support them.

The technical analysis and policy development guided further system development and refinement before soliciting projects and funding strategies from the region's 25 cities, three counties, TriMet, South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART), Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) – the region's transportation providers. On June 15, 2009, the Metro Council, in conjunction with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro

Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) issued a “call for projects” to refine RTP investment priorities. The RTP goals, draft performance targets and refinement criteria provided policy direction for investment priorities to be brought forward for consideration in the final 2035 RTP.

JPACT-ENDORSED PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Economy	Wealth creation – By 2035, increase the number of living-wage jobs in centers and employment and industrial areas by XX percent compared to 2000 through job creation and retention.
	Safety – By 2035, reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities by 50 percent compared to 2005.
	Reliability – By 2035, reduce vehicle hours of delay per person by 10 percent compared to 2005.
Environment	Climate change – By 2035, reduce transportation-related carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.
	Active transportation – By 2035, triple walking, biking and transit trips compared to 2005 to reduce vehicle miles traveled per person.
	Clean air – By 2035, achieve zero percent population exposure to at-risk levels of air pollution.
Equity	Compact urban form – By 2035, increase floor area ratios in centers and corridors by XX percent compared to 2000.
	Affordability – By 2035, the share of the region’s households that are cost-burdened declined by 20 percent compared to 2000.
	Equity – By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by public transit for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations compared to 2000.

JPACT-ENDORSED REFINEMENT CRITERIA

- Make multi-modal travel safe and reliable
- Target investments to support local aspiration and the 2040 Growth Concept
- Provide multi-modal freight mobility and access
- Expand transit coverage and frequency
- Expand active transportation options
- Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions
- Address transportation needs of underserved communities

Projects were solicited from county coordinating committees, the city of Portland, TriMet, SMART, the Port of Portland and ODOT. Each project sponsor was requested to identify investment priorities consistent with the draft RTP performance targets and criteria, and within the funding target established by JPACT. Projects and programs were requested to come from plans or studies that had been developed through a public process. The solicitation resulted in 1,058 proposed projects with a total estimated cost of \$19.6 billion.

The draft RTP and projects, draft Regional Transportation System Management and Operations Plan (TSMO), draft Regional Freight Plan and draft High Capacity Transit System Plan summary report and complete list of projects were released for a 30-day public comment period that was held from September 15 to October 15, 2009. The RTP comment package was released as part of the Making the

Greatest Place effort and Metro's chief operating officer's recommendation titled "Strategies for a sustainable and prosperous region."

Attachment 1 to the staff report provides a more detailed summary of the stakeholder and public involvement conducted from Spring 2006 to Fall 2009, and specific comments received during the most recent public comment period held from September 15 to October 15, 2009. Public comment received will be considered by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council prior to action on this resolution.

Following acceptance of the RTP, staff will conduct a final analysis and prepare findings, an updated draft document and the functional plan amendments needed to implement the new policies and strategies. The final draft RTP will then be released for 45 days of public comment beginning in April 2010, before MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council consider approval by ordinance in June 2010.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition:** There is no known opposition to the resolution. However, concerns have been raised about two projects and performance of the package of projects submitted by local governments, TriMet and ODOT relative to the plan's performance targets.
 - **I-5/99W study recommendations (Alternative 7)** – Metro received more than 60 comments on the arterial connections recommended from the study. Comments opposed to some or all of the I-5/OR 99W arterial connections came from mostly from residents concerned about a lack of public process surrounding the proposed Alternative 7, increased traffic, damage to property values, damage to the environment and damage to a community park that would be affected by the northern arterial. Staff recommend revisions to the timing and description of the recommendation to better describe the overall concept of the three arterial recommendation, conditions approved by the study's Project Steering Committee and 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."
 - **Sunnybrook Road extension (Project # 10019)** – Metro receive nearly 30 comments on this project. Comments opposed to the Sunnybrook Boulevard extensions came from individuals and community organizations concerned about potential environmental damage to sensitive natural areas. The City of Milwaukie is also opposed to the connection due to impacts to adjacent neighborhoods. Comments in support came from local jurisdictions and area colleges wanting to improve local connectivity. Staff recommends retaining this project. The project is the last of a set of transportation improvements identified over 20 years ago in the Clackamas Regional Center (CRC) Plan. The project provides local connectivity and access to Harmony Community College, improving circulation for all modes of travel and reducing the need to widen existing roads. Throughout the EIS and subsequent processes a number of concerns raised and addressed regarding environmental impacts. Actions already taken to address concerns raised include realignment, reduced width, and completing a Carbon Analysis/Reduction Study (the first within the State of Oregon). The RTP recommends continuing to minimize impacts during future planning, design and construction phases through the application of a "practical design" approach and "green street" treatments.
 - **Greenhouse gas emissions** – The RTP has received criticism from organizations such as the Bicycle Transportation Alliance and the Coalition for a Livable Future, as well as elected officials, that the plan fails to meet the RTP's (and the state's) stated goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Staff is not recommending significant changes to the project list or a delay in the adoption of the RTP. It will take more than changing transportation investments to affect climate change. More compact urban development and strategies such as parking management, tolling and congestion pricing that can influence the demand on our road network

must also be considered. Adopting the RTP now is essential to meet state deadlines and to move the discussion forward determining the best strategies and approaches to address climate change. An action plan will be developed to demonstrate Metro's leadership and commitment to address this issue in a timely and comprehensive manner.

2. **Legal Antecedents:** Several Federal, State and regional laws and actions relate to this action.

Federal regulations include:

- Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S. C. 7401 and 23 U.S.C. 109(j)], as amended].
- US EPA transportation conformity rules (40 CFR, parts 51 and 93).
- USDOT rules that require Metro to update RTPs on a four-year cycle [23 CFR 450.322(a)].

State regulations include:

- Statewide planning goals.
- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Planning (OAR Chapter 660, Division 12).
- Oregon Transportation Plan and implementing modal plans, including the Oregon Highway Plan.
- 2009 Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act (House Bill 2001).
- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Conformity, (OAR Chapter 340, Division 252).
- 2006 State Implementation Plan (SIP).
- 2006 Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and 2007 Portland Area Ozone Maintenance Plan.

Metro legislation includes:

- Resolution 05-3610A, "For the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the "Budgeting for Outcomes" Approach to Establishing Regional Transportation Priorities" adopted by the Metro Council on September 22, 2005.
- Resolution No. 06-3661, "For the Purpose of Approving A Work Program For the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and Authorizing the Chief Operating Officer to Amend Contract No. 926975)" adopted by the Metro Council on June 15, 2006.
- Resolution No. 07-3793, "For the Purpose of Accepting the Chapter 1 Regional Transportation Policy Framework as the Provisional Draft For the Purpose Of Completing Phase 3 of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update" adopted by the Metro Council on March 15, 2007.
- Resolution 07-3831B, "For the Purpose of Approving The Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Pending Air Quality Conformity Analysis" adopted by the Metro Council on December 13, 2007.
- Resolution No. 08-3911, "For the Purpose of Approving the Air Quality Conformity Determination For the Federal Component of the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Reconfirming the 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program" adopted by the Metro Council on February 28, 2008.
- Resolution No. 08-3940, "For the Purpose of Affirming a Definition of a "Successful Region" and Committing Metro to Work With Regional Partners to Identify Performance Indicators and Targets and to Develop a Decision-Making Process to Create Successful Communities" adopted by the Metro Council on June 26, 2008.

- 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” adopted by the Metro Council on July 9, 2009.

3. **Anticipated Effects:** With approval, staff will:

- 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 by March 31, 2010, for final public review.
- Proceed with final system analysis and the federally-required air quality conformity.
- Work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments to prepare amendments to Exhibit E to this resolution and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan by March 31, 2010, to direct how local plans will implement the new RTP.
- Work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments in winter, 2010, to incorporate the new RTP policies and performance targets in the next policy update to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (“MTIP”).
- Prepare materials for Council, JPACT and MPAC policy discussions on tolling, parking management and other pricing strategies in 2010.
- Work with the ODOT, TriMet and local governments to document mobility corridor strategies by March 31, 2010.
- Work with ODOT, TriMet and local governments to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios designed to reduce GHG emissions by January 1, 2012, as directed by the 2009 Legislature through House Bill 2001, and select one scenario for regional and local implementation that meets the state targets. Metro will forward recommendations from this effort to the next RTP update in 2014. Recommendations may include refinements to the RTP policies, performance targets and investment priorities.
- Work with the ODOT, TriMet and local governments to document the region’s inability to meet current mobility standards as defined in Policy 1F of the Oregon Highway Plan and proposed actions to maintain state highway mobility “as much as feasible and to avoid further degradation” by March 31, 2010. This work may result in new alternative mobility standards and regional and local policies and actions needed to meet them.
- Hold final public hearings in Spring 2010 and submit final RTP and findings to LCDC in the manner of periodic review.
- Submit final RTP and air quality conformity determination to FHWA for approval.


4. **Budget Impacts:** There is no financial impact to approval of this resolution.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve Resolution No. 09-XXXX.

Attachment 1 to Staff Report to Resolution No. 09-XXXX
CLICK HERE FOR REPORT

October 2009
Public comment report



2035

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Public comment report

October 2009



Date: November 10, 2009
To: MPAC
From: Malu Wilkinson, UGR Project Manager
Re: MPAC recommendation on the 2009 Urban Growth Report

At its November 18, 2009 meeting, MPAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the Metro Council on whether to accept the population and employment forecast and the urban growth report as reasonable and complete. That Metro Council action will take the form of consideration of a resolution (included in packet) in December 2009. In order to facilitate MPAC's deliberation, Metro staff has articulated several questions for MPAC to consider:

ACTION ITEM: Does MPAC recommend that the Metro Council vote in favor of the resolution?

Specifically,

1. Does MPAC find the following analyses to be reasonable and complete?
 - The 2030 population and employment forecast
 - The UGR's assessment of residential demand and capacity
 - The UGR's assessment of general, non-industrial demand and capacity
 - The UGR's assessment of general, industrial demand and capacity
 - The UGR's assessment of large lot employment demand and capacity (*or, does MPAC recommend the amendment of the UGR's assessment of large employment lot need from a range of 200 – 800 acres to a range of 200 – 1,500 acres, as described in an October 26, 2009 memo from Malu Wilkinson to MPAC?*)

2. Does MPAC recommend amendment of the resolution to specifically mention the housing needs analysis (*language as proposed by the City of Portland at the October 28, 2009 MPAC meeting*)?

UGR-related materials in packet

To facilitate MPAC's deliberation, Metro staff has included a number of items in the MPAC packet. MPAC has previously seen all of these items at recent meetings. These items include:

- A draft resolution for consideration by the Metro Council
- Proposed amendment to the resolution drafted by the City of Portland (regarding the housing needs analysis)
- October 26, 2009 memo to MPAC from Malu Wilkinson regarding a proposed amendment to the UGR's assessment of large lot employment need

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 09-XXXX
POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT)
FORECASTS AND THE URBAN GROWTH) Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
REPORT AS SUPPORT FOR DETERMINATION Michael Jordan with the Concurrence of
OF CAPACITY OF THE URBAN GROWTH Council President David Bragdon
BOUNDARY

WHEREAS, state law requires Metro to determine the capacity of the urban growth boundary (UGB) to accommodate the next 20 years' worth of population and employment growth by the end of December, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro published range forecasts of population and employment growth to the years 2030 and 2060 on March 19, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro published a preliminary analysis of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new dwelling units relating to the range of forecast population growth on March 31, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro published a preliminary analysis of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new employment relating to the range of forecast employment growth on May 6, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought and received comments on the preliminary analyses of housing and employment capacity from its Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and its Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), local governments in the region, public, private and non-profit organizations and citizens;

WHEREAS, Metro considered the comments and published revised draft analyses of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate growth to year 2030 on September 15, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought and received comments on the revised draft analyses from MPAC and JPACT; local governments in the region; and public, private and non-profit organizations and citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council held open houses and public hearings on the revised draft analyses on September 21, 22 and 24 and October 1, 8 and 15, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro considered comments received and made revisions to the final draft analyses of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new dwelling units and employment relating to the range of forecast population and employment growth; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council

1. The Council accepts the "20 and 50 year Regional population and employment forecasts" dated December __, 2009, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit A, as a basis for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year

2030 and for actions the Council will take to add capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14.

2. The Council accepts the “Urban Growth Report 2009-2030”, dated December __, 2009, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit B, as a basis for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 and for actions the Council will take to add housing and employment capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14.
3. Acceptance of Exhibits A and B by the Council meets Metro’s responsibility under state law to analyze the capacity of the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 as a preliminary step toward providing sufficient capacity to accommodate that growth. The Council will make a final land use decision to respond to this capacity analysis in 2010.
4. The Council directs the Chief Operating Officer to submit Exhibits A and B, together with such actions the Council adopts by ordinance to add any needed capacity pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14, to the Land Conservation and Development Commission as part of periodic review pursuant to ORS 197.626, following adoption of the capacity ordinance in 2010.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 17th day of December, 2009

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney



CITY OF

PORTLAND, OREGON

Sam Adams, Mayor

Nick Fish, Commissioner
Amanda Fritz, Commissioner
Randy Leonard, Commissioner
Dan Saltzman, Commissioner

10/28/09

**City of Portland Proposed Amendments
DRAFT Resolution NO. 09-XXXX**

From Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS AND THE URBAN GROWTH REPORT AS SUPPORT FOR DETERMINATION OF CAPACITY OF THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

Add:

“WHEREAS, state law requires Metro to provide capacity to encourage the availability of dwelling units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of households expected over the planning period; and

“WHEREAS, Metro published a Housing Needs Analysis that showed the effects on housing affordability of forecast growth under existing policies and investment levels; and

Amend:

“2. The Council accepts the “Urban Growth Report 2009-2030”, dated December __, 2009, **with its Housing Needs Analysis,** attached and incorporated in this resolution as Exhibit B, as a bases for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 and for actions the Council will take to add housing and employment capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goals 14 **and 10.**

Rationale:

MPAC has had considerable discussion about regional equity and affordable housing. By referencing the regional Housing Needs Analysis in the resolution, the Metro Council will expressly acknowledge that the evidence-based analysis on equity and housing is important and that the implications of its findings must be addressed. The analysis indicated, without policy or investment intervention, the number of cost-burdened households is likely to double over the next 20 years. The analysis uses a new method that includes transportation costs to determine cost-burdened households. Significant findings about geographic equity and cost-burdened household distributions will be affected by policy and investment choices by regional decision makers. The region’s policy and investment choices in transportation and transit can influence both the equity and region’s share of cost burdened households - and can play an important role in reducing the share of households in the region spending more than 50% of income on housing and transportation combined compared to 2000. (See Metro Memo dated 10/7/09 from Malu Wilkerson to MPAC, p. 3, Question #5. Equity ...)



Date: October 26, 2009
To: MPAC
From: Malu Wilkinson, UGR Project Manager
Re: Proposed amendment to the 2009 Urban Growth Report: range of large lot need

Policy context

At the October 23, 2009 MPAC retreat, members of MPAC expressed support for the Draft Urban Growth Report's (UGR) analysis and its conclusions regarding the region's capacity to accommodate residential, non-industrial, and general industrial growth. However, members of MPAC requested that Metro staff balance the UGR's forecast-based, technical assessment of the region's large lot employment need with a policy perspective. This additional policy perspective is intended to further acknowledge the following:

- The inherent uncertainty of forecasting employment in large, traded-sector firms, which may consider several cities, regions, states or countries when choosing a site. The range of large lots that will be needed over the next 20 years will be the product of a number of factors that are impossible to forecast, including:
 - Decisions of individual firms that participate in a global marketplace
 - The political will of cities, the region, and the State (both here and in other regions) to implement economic development strategies
- The need to have flexibility in the region's plans to attract and retain potential traded-sector employment growth
- Cities in the region are required to complete Economic Opportunity Analyses (EOA) under Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 9. The City of Hillsboro recently completed such an analysis in cooperation with the cities of Forest Grove, Cornelius, North Plains and Banks. The City of Hillsboro has also indicated it has received a number of inquiries from traded-sector firms seeking large sites. To meet its economic development goals, the City of Hillsboro has identified a need for an additional five to seven lots of at least 50 acres over the next 20 years. While Metro cannot take all of the local analyses and add them up to determine a regional need, the City of Hillsboro's recent work can serve as a proxy to support considering a wider range of large lot demand over the next 20 years.
- Rail and marine freight uses are critical to the health of the region's economy. These freight terminal uses can require relatively large areas of land, but do not necessarily require high employment densities. Consequently, their needs may not be adequately accounted for in the UGR using an employment forecast.

This proposed amendment is consistent with the guidance offered by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-024-0040, which states that: *“the 20-year need determinations are estimates which, although based on the best available information and methodologies, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision.”*

Proposed amendment to the UGR

Metro staff proposes that the final UGR should recognize the policy benefits of considering a wider range of potential large lot demand for employment purposes. The proposed amendment would also acknowledge the limits of further technical analysis in conclusively quantifying the extent of this demand. It is proposed that the large lot analysis portion of the UGR show a gap in the region’s large lot supply of between 200 to 1,500 acres (this would revise the Draft UGR, which showed a gap of 200 to 800 acres).

Next steps

The proposed widening of the UGR’s range for large lot need does not indicate a decision to choose either the low or the high end of the range, or a conclusion on whether the gap will be filled through urban growth boundary expansions or actions that provide large lots within the current UGB.

The widened range provides more flexibility for the MPAC Employment Subcommittee to discuss policy options for addressing the region’s need for large lots. During 2010, MPAC and the Metro Council will also continue a dialogue about where in the region additional large lot capacity may be needed or desired and the policy options that are available to close the gap. Such options include, but are not limited to: assembly of tax lots, brownfield cleanup, regulations to protect industrial areas, investments in infrastructure, and a “fast-track UGB” expansion process that responds to verified opportunities to attract traded-sector firms.

In 2010, MPAC and the Metro Council will identify which combination of actions (increased investments and efforts inside the UGB or potential UGB expansions) best supports the six outcomes that define a successful region. The Metro Council will consider that decision by ordinance at the end of 2010.

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.

 Metro | Agenda **REVISED**

Meeting: Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)
Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009
Time: 4 to 7 p.m.
Place: Council Chambers

- | | | | |
|---------|-------|--|-------------------------|
| 4 PM | 1. | <u>CALL TO ORDER</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| 4:02 PM | 2. | <u>SELF INTRODUCTIONS & COMMUNICATIONS</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| 4:05 PM | 3. | <u>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS</u> | |
| 4:10 PM | 4. | <u>CONSENT AGENDA</u> | Shane Bemis, Vice Chair |
| | | * Consideration of the MPAC Retreat Minutes for October 23, 2009 | |
| | | * Consideration of the MPAC Minutes for October 28, 2009 | |
| 4:15 PM | 5. | <u>COUNCIL UPDATE</u> | |
| | 6. | <u>ACTION ITEMS</u> | |
| 4:20 PM | 6.1 | * Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Accepting the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, with the Following Elements for Final Review and Analysis for Air Quality Conformance: The Transportation Systems Management and Operations Action Plan; The Regional Freight Plan; The High Capacity Transit System Plan; and The Regional Transportation Functional Plan – <u>ACTION REQUESTED</u> | Kim Ellis |
| 4:30 PM | 6.1.a | • Exhibit F (Approval requested) <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Greenhouse gas emissions and RTP Climate Action Plan (<u>Approval of JPACT recommendation requested</u>) | |
| 4:50 PM | 6.1.b | ○ RTP Performance targets and application of RTP policies and targets in local plans and local, regional and state investment priorities (<u>Approval of JPACT/MTAC recommendation requested</u>) | |
| 5 PM | 6.1.c | ○ Alternative mobility standards (<u>Approval of MTAC recommendation requested</u>) | |
| 5:05 PM | 6.1.d | ○ Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities (<u>Input to JPACT and Metro Council on land use considerations of corridor priorities</u>) | |
| 5:15 PM | 6.1.e | ○ I-5/99W Connector Study recommendations (<u>Approval of MTAC recommendation requested</u>) | |
| 5:35 PM | 6.1.f | ○ Columbia River Crossing amendment (<u>Recommendation on Robert Liberty's amendment requested</u>) | |
| 5:50 PM | | • Exhibit G (Consent items for consideration as a package) - <u>Approval of MTAC recommendation requested</u>
<i>MPAC members may raise consent items for discussion.</i> | |
| 5:55 PM | | • Amendments proposed by MPAC members
• Final recommendation on RTP Resolution as amended | |

Continued on back

6 PM 6.2 * Resolution No. 09-XXXX, For the Purpose of Accepting the Population and Employment Forecasts and the Urban Growth Report As Support for Determination of Capacity of the Urban Growth Boundary – ACTION REQUESTED **Malu Wilkinson**
Ted Reid

6:10 PM

- Staff recap elements being adopted by Resolution
 - The 20 and 50 year population and employment forecast.
 - The conclusion that there is a 26,100 to 103,600 dwelling unit gap in meeting the need for housing within the existing UGB.
 - The conclusion that there no gap in meeting the need for general industrial land.
 - The conclusion that there is a gap of approximately 1000 acres in meeting the need for general non-industrial land at the high end of the forecast and no gap at the low end of the forecast.
 - The conclusion that there is a gap of 200-800 acres in meeting the need for large lot industrial land.

6:20 PM • City of Portland amendment relating to Housing Needs Analysis
6:30 PM • Cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Sherwood and Washington County amendment on population and employment forecast range

6:40 PM • Staff recap amendment on large lot industrial

6:50 PM • Other amendments and final adoption

6:55 PM 7. **MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS**

7 PM 8. **ADJOURN**

Shane Bemis, Vice Chair

* Material available electronically.

Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available 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.



Date: November 13, 2009

To: Metro Council, JPACT, MPAC and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: Regional Transportation Plan Approval and Next Steps

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO APPROVE THE RTP NOW?

The resolution under consideration provides staff with the direction needed to finalize the RTP between December 2009 and June 2010.

- Legal requirements: State law requires us to adopt an RTP by June 2010.
- Action not talk: The region needs to move from talking about actions to taking actions. The RTP resolution and RTP Climate Action Plan outlines a course of action that will be implemented at the local and regional levels. Deferring action on the RTP will defer implementation of the plan, including initiating the House Bill 2001 scenarios work.
- Investments: The RTP policy framework and performance targets will be translated into project selection criteria in early 2010 to guide near-term investment decisions (e.g., MTIP allocations, federal reauthorization and appropriations requests). The RTP must be approved in 2009 to allow the policies and targets to be considered in these funding discussions in early 2010.
- Analysis: The final system analysis and air quality conformity will take 6 to 8 weeks to complete, and must be completed by mid-February to be part of the Spring 2010 final public comment period. Closure on the RTP projects is needed because this analysis requires project-specific definition. Deferring action on the RTP will defer when this analysis can begin.
- Corridor refinement planning: Work can begin on the next priority corridor plan(s) upon approval of the RTP. Deferring action on the RTP will defer when this work can begin.
- Making the Greatest Place: In December 2010, the region will need to decide how to accommodate jobs and housing for the next 20 years. The state component of the RTP includes a number of high capacity transit projects that will strongly influence the shape of our region. The RTP must be approved in 2009, in order to assume those projects in the final UGR analysis in 2010. Absent those aspirations and land use actions to accommodate a majority of future growth in areas served by transit, we may be forced to expand the urban growth boundary in ways that do not support a reduction in GHG emissions.

NEXT STEPS

Upcoming milestones to finalize the state component of the 2035 RTP include:

Dec. 10, 2009	JPACT action on 2035 RTP, pending air quality conformity analysis
Dec. 17, 2009	Metro Council action on 2035 RTP, pending air quality conformity analysis
Jan. 4 – Feb. 15, 2010	Final system analysis and air quality conformity
Feb. 26, 2010	TPAC discussion on final draft RTP (including final system analysis and mobility corridor strategies), functional plan amendments and alternative mobility standards
March 3, 2010	MTAC discussion on final draft RTP, functional plan amendments and alternative mobility standards
March 10, 2010	MPAC discussion on final draft RTP, functional plan amendments and alternative mobility standards
March 11, 2010	JPACT discussion on final draft RTP, functional plan amendments and alternative mobility standards
March 15, 2010	Final 45-day public comment period begins; proposed alternative mobility standards submitted to OTC for consideration
April 29, 2010	Final hearing; public comment period ends
May 19, 2010	MTAC final recommendation on 2035 RTP
May 28, 2010	TPAC final recommendation on air quality conformity and 2035 RTP
June 9, 2010	MPAC final action on 2035 RTP
June 10, 2010	JPACT and Metro Council final action on air quality conformity and 2035 RTP
Fall 2010	Final RTP submitted to DLCD in the manner of periodic review; air quality conformity submitted to U.S. DOT for review



Date: November 13, 2009

To: Metro Council, MPAC and JPACT and interested parties

From: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner

Re: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Supplemental Project List Analysis

Background

Staff was requested to review the list of projects and identify those projects that may result in increased greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). This memo summarizes a supplemental evaluation of the projects included in the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

- The analysis included is intended to more fully describe the make-up of the highway and road-related projects for your consideration.
- This does not represent an analysis of the impacts of different projects on greenhouse gas emissions. Individual highway and road-related projects may have positive or negative greenhouse emission impacts.
- A system-level analysis continues to be the recommended approach for evaluating the impact of individual projects on greenhouse gas emissions. GHG analysis at the system-level is best able to capture the synergistic affect of multiple projects and regional strategies, such as compact urban form use, parking management, vehicle technology, congestion pricing and tolling. There are also “boundary” issues with evaluating the potential GHG impact of projects. For example, emissions that are generated along a particular facility may be “caused” by commuters from another part of the region.

2035 RTP Investment Strategy - Project List

All of the projects submitted by sponsoring agencies were compiled into a comprehensive master list that was included in the draft RTP released for public comment on September 15. A total number of 1,058 projects and programs were included, with an estimated cost of \$20.8 billion (in 2007 dollars).

Figure 1 includes a summary of the overall project list as proposed in the draft RTP for context. Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide a more detailed summary of the highway and road-related projects for purposes of this analysis.

Figure 1. Regional Transportation Investment Strategy (September 15, 2009)




Table 1. Throughway Projects by Type

	Number of Projects	Percent of Throughway Projects	Percent of Total RTP Projects	TOTAL COST	Percent of Total RTP Project Cost
THROUGHWAYS	35		4%	\$4,499,787,000	22%
Interchanges	17	49%	2%	\$403,287,000	2%
General Purpose Capacity	11	31%	1%	\$685,500,000	3%
Columbia River Crossing	1	3%	<1%	\$2,982,000,000	14%
ODOT Operations (e.g., auxilliary lanes, access management)	6	17%	1%	\$429,000,000	2%

Notes: Differences between percentages in Table 1 and Figure 1 are due to rounding. Throughways include I-5, I-205, US 26, I-405, and I-84.

Table 2. Road and Bridge Projects by Type

	Number of Projects	Percent of Roads/Bridges Projects	Percent of Total RTP Projects	TOTAL COST	Percent of Total RTP Project Cost
ROADS AND BRIDGES	542		51%	\$6,555,626,902	31%
Reconstruction	177	33%	17%	\$1,514,517,279	7%
Boulevard retrofit	14	3%	1%	\$141,736,943	1%
New Connections	129	24%	12%	\$1,991,848,009	10%
System Management and Operations	27	5%	3%	\$64,351,605	<1%
Widening within RTP "planned system" definition	188	35%	18%	\$2,743,173,065	13%
Widening above "planned system" (e.g., 7-lane arterials; grade separated arterials)	7	1%	1%	\$100,000,000	<1%

Notes: Differences between percentages in Table 1 and Figure 1 are due to rounding. Additional system management and operations projects are included in a separate TSMO category in Figure 1. District and regional highways are included in the road and bridges category.

Table 3 Road and Bridge Projects by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Number of Roads/ Bridges/ Projects	Number of Widening Projects	Number of New Connection Projects	Number of Reconstruction Projects	Number of Boulevard Projects	Number of TSMO Projects
Beaverton	27	7	16	3	0	1
Clackamas County	45	29	11	2	1	2
Cornelius	9	1	4	3	0	1
Damascus	6	3	2	1	0	0
Forest Grove	8	1	5	1	1	0
Gresham	88	20	25	36	5	2
Happy Valley	11	6	4	0	0	1
Hillsboro	76	27	25	22	0	2
Lake Oswego	4	0	0	4	0	0
Milwaukie	3	0	0	3	0	0
Multnomah County	26	4	2	19	0	1
ODOT	2	0	0	2	0	0
Oregon City	8	5	0	3	0	0
Portland	75	8	6	47	6	8
Port of Portland	6	2	3	0	0	1
Sherwood	20	2	7	9	1	1
Tigard	22	12	6	4	0	0
Troutdale	3	1	1	1	0	0
Tualatin	28	13	5	7	0	3
Washington County	68	50	6	8	0	4
West Linn	2	1	0	1	0	0
Wilsonville	5	3	1	1	0	0
	542	195	129	177	14	27

Proposed order of business for adoption of the RTP Resolution by MPAC

1. Andy Cotugno: Provide an **overview of the RTP legislation** MPAC is requested to take action on **and the order of business today**.
 - Printed materials in the packet include:
 - **Yellow:** The RTP resolution recommended for adoption.
 - **Buff:** This is one of the Exhibits proposed to be adopted by the resolution. It itemizes all of the current requirements that local comprehensive plans must comply with to be consistent with the RTP. Any revisions that are needed will have to be incorporated before final adoption in June, 2010.
 - **Cherry:** Specific amendments proposed for approval by MPAC (the details of which are in the **green** and **purple** packets).
 - **Green:** Exhibit F proposed for adoption as part of the RTP resolution: Five amendments are included for consideration after **Discussion** by MPAC.
 - **Pink:** Amendments proposed for adoption on a **Consent** basis without discussion.
 - **Purple:** Amendments introduced by a Metro Councilor, JPACT member or MPAC member. In general, each action that is itemized is incorporated into either the **green** discussion items of the **pink** Consent items. However, the Committee will be asked to comment on item 9, page 5 in the Purple packet relating to the Columbia River Crossing Project.
 - We will ask to put the **main motion** on the table.
 - Then we will **introduce the six amendments in the green and purple packets**, one-by-one, proposed for action by MPAC on Nov. 18.
 - Greenhouse gas emissions and RTP climate action plan (*green discussion item #1*) - Recommend approval of the JPACT amendment to the RTP.
 - RTP performance targets and application of RTP policies/targets in local plans (*green discussion item #2*) - Recommend approval of the JPACT/MTAC amendment to the RTP.
 - Alternative Mobility Standards (*green discussion item #3*) – Concur with approach to work with the Oregon Transportation Commission to develop alternative standards prior to final adoption in June, 2010.
 - Corridor Refinement Plan priorities (*green discussion item #4*) – Provide comments to JPACT from a land use perspective that may impact corridor refinement planning priorities.
 - I-5/99W connector study recommendations (*green discussion item #5*) - Recommend approval of the MTAC amendment to the RTP.
 - Columbia River Crossing expiration date amendment (*purple discussion item #9*).

Each discussion item will be introduced by staff, the chair will seek a motion to amend the Resolution with either the proposed amendment or some adaptation of the proposed amendment, the committee will have an opportunity to discuss and then action will be sought on the amendment.

 - Then we will ask if any member wishes to have any proposed amendments **moved from the pink Consent** recommendation (**Exhibit G**) for discussion by MPAC.
 - If yes, take up the items requested for discussion.

- Then, the **Consent** items will be introduced for approval as a packet.
 - Then, the overall **Resolution, as amended** will be up for approval.
2. Chair Shane Bemis: Ask for a motion/second to recommend adoption of the **main RTP Resolution**. This puts the main motion on the table.
 3. Staff present the proposed amendment for **cherry/green** discussion item #1: **Greenhouse Gas and Climate Action Plan**.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to amend the Resolution with the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change Action Plan amendment or some adaptation.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
 4. Staff present the proposed amendment for **cherry/green** discussion item #2: **RTP Performance Targets**.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to amend the Resolution for the RTP Performance Targets amendment or some adaptation.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
 5. Staff present the recommendation for **cherry/green** discussion item #3 to work with the Oregon Transportation Commission to develop **alternative mobility standards**.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to accept the recommendation.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed recommendation.
 6. Staff present the technical rankings for **cherry/green** discussion item #4: **Corridor Refinement Plan Priorities** and information on statements of local support.
Chair: Ask the MPAC for input to JPACT on information that should affect prioritization from a land use perspective.
 7. Staff present **cherry/green** discussion item #5: the **I-5/99W Study Area** proposed amendment.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to amend the Resolution for the I-5/99W Study area proposed amendment or some adaptation.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
 8. Staff present **cherry/purple** item #9: **Columbia River Crossing expiration date**.
Provide Councilor Liberty an opportunity to speak to his amendment.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to amend the Resolution to include the Columbia River Crossing expiration date amendment or some adaptation.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
 9. Chair: Ask if any member wishes to have any proposed amendments **removed from the Consent** recommendation.
Take them up as needed. Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Ask for a motion/second to approve the **Consent recommendations**.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.

Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.

10. Ask if any member has any **additional proposed amendments**.

11. At this point the motion on the table is the **RTP Resolution as amended** by the above amendments.

Call the question to either approve or disapprove the Resolution as amended.

**RTP CLIMATE ACTION PLAN - GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS
AND HB 2001 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS**

**FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET –
EXHIBIT F PAGES 1-7**

TPAC AND MTAC 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 2011.
- MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council commitment to policy discussions on the application of pricing strategies in the Metro region in 2010.
- Between 2011 and 2014, develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios” designed to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles and adopt one scenario that meets the state targets after public review and comment.
- Metro will incorporate recommendations from this effort in the next RTP update in 2014.

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve TPAC and MTAC Recommendation.
- Amend the RTP Climate Action Plan into Chapter 5 of the RTP as the region’s commitment to address this important issue prior to the next RTP update. (see pages 5-7 of Exhibit F)

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of JPACT Recommendation

RTP PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND IMPLEMENTATION

FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET – EXHIBIT F PAGES 8-11

TPAC and MTAC recommended approval of the staff recommendation as amended in underline below:

TPAC AND MTAC 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 2011.
- Monitor the regional-level performance targets as part of periodic updates to the RTP.
- In Winter 2010, develop functional plan amendments to direct how local plans will be consistent with the new RTP policies and performance targets.
- Identify 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.
- 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 2011. 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.

RTP PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND IMPLEMENTATION

ATTACHMENT 1

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.
	<u>Freight reliability</u> – 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 <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	<u>Affordability</u> – 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</u> by 25 percent combined compared to 2000.
	<u>Access to daily needs</u> – 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.

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve TPAC and MTAC Recommendation.

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of JPACT/MTAC Recommendation

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.

ALTERNATIVE MOBILITY STANDARDS

FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET - EXHIBIT F PAGES 12-15

TPAC AND MTAC 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.

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Discussion item moved to December 10 meeting.

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of MTAC Recommendation

RTP CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION

FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET – EXHIBIT F PAGES 16-58

TPAC AND MTAC RECOMMENDATION:

- JPACT and MPAC consideration of the prioritization data in Attachment 2. 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.

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Accept technical rankings in Attachment 2. (see updated Attachment 2, dated 11/17/09)
- Prioritization to be considered at December 10 meeting.

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Input to JPACT and Metro Council on land use considerations of corridor priorities

I-5/99W CONNECTOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET EXHIBIT F PAGES 59-71

TPAC AND MTAC RECOMMENDATION:

TPAC and MTAC recommended approval of the staff recommendation as amended in **bold** and underline below:

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 all the conditions are met, **including conducting the I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan including Mobility Corridors 2, 3 and 20;**
 - 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.

I-5/99W CONNECTOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Discussion item moved to December 10 meeting.

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of MTAC Recommendation

COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING AMENDMENT

FULL BACKGROUND ON THIS ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE GREEN PACKET – EXHIBIT F PAGE 77 AND PURPLE MEMO FROM KIM ELLIS, TO MPAC AND METRO COUNCIL, DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2009

Metro Councilor Robert Liberty has submitted a proposed amendment for the consideration of JPACT and the Metro Council. The Metro Council discussed the amendment at its November 17, 2009 work session.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

Add the following language to the 2035 RTP:

“If commitments to fund the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the Columbia River Crossing project from the federal, state, regional and local governments have not been made, evidenced by an adopted intergovernmental agreement, by September 1, 2011, the LPA shall be withdrawn and funds identified for further study of the project shall be reserved for study of potential alternative investments in the corridor.”

The rationale for the amendment is as follows:

1. To provoke a discussion about funding realities and trade-offs regarding how support for this project may have near-term implications for other regional priorities at the Federal level.
2. To provide state and federal funding authorities with a clear deadline to establish their part of the funding plan.
3. To establish a clear timeline within which the cost to further develop the proposal will be continue to be sustained.
4. To ensure that if the project is not funded there will be revenues from amounts already committed to develop the project to define a substitute, lower cost project for the region to consider.

The change in circumstances since the Metro Council’s approval of the Locally Preferred Alternative in July 2008 that suggest the need for the amendment are:

- The decision of the 2009 Oregon Legislature not to earmark funding for the project.
- Critical public comments regarding the cost of the proposal made by Congressmen DeFazio and Baird.
- The outcome of the recent mayoral election in Vancouver, Washington.

11/12/09 JPACT RECOMMENDATION:

- Discussion item to be considered at December 10 meeting.

MPAC ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommendation on Metro Councilor Robert Liberty's amendment

PAGE 1		RTP REGIONAL CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLAN PRIORITIZATION TECHNICAL RATING (November 17, 2009)													
Rankings are: 1= Low 2 = Med 3 = High	Description	Portland Central City to Wilsonville, including Tigard- Shenwood/Newberg/Tual atin, including Barbur / 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 (between I-84 and US 26)		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	High	Medium	Low	Medium	N/A	N/A	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	
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	1.0	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		33.0		34.3	
E: Local Commitment and Support [INFORMATION SUPPLIED VIA LETTER FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS]															
E1: Demonstrated local jurisdiction support (# of jurisdictions)	8 agencies or jurisdictions									1 agency comment		8 agencies, local MOU &		2 agencies	
E2: Demonstrated community interest in issues under consideration	2 groups											7 groups		5-agency scope letter	
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															
				n/a		n/a				n/a		n/a		n/a	
GRAND TOTAL--TECHNICAL SCORES				39.5		36.6				37.0		33.0		34.3	



#1

City of Portland

Proposed Amendments to RTP Resolution NO. 09-XXXX

Before MPAC

Introduced by Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz

November 18, 2009

EXCERPT FROM RTP RESOLUTION

Amend:

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

Amend:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. ~~Accepts~~ Approves the Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") (Exhibit A and ~~Appendices 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).

Explanation:

1. The memo from Kim Ellis, Metro RTP Project Manager, to TPAC dated November 13, 2009 lists advantages for approving the RTP policy framework and performance measures in 2009 including:

The policy framework and performance measures will be translated into project selection criteria and used to guide near-term investment decisions in early 2010 including MTIP allocations, and federal reauthorization and appropriations requests.



#2
City of Portland
Proposed Amendments to RTP Resolution NO. 09-XXXX

Before MPAC
Introduced by Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz
November 18, 2009

EXCERPT FROM RTP RESOLUTION

Amend:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

2. ~~Accepts~~ Approves 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.

Explanation:

2. The amendment “approves” rather than “accepts” revisions to the federal component.



#3

City of Portland

Proposed Amendments to RTP Resolution NO. 09-XXXX

Before MPAC

Introduced by Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz

November 18, 2009

EXCERPT FROM RTP RESOLUTION

Amend:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

3. Accepts the RTP project lists solely for the purposes of obtaining public comment and determining conformance with the Clean Air Act.

Explanation:

3. The resolution as it now stands asks JPACT and Metro Council to accept the RTP for the purpose of determining conformance with the Clean Air Act. The language above adds "for the sole purpose" of determining air quality performance.



#4

City of Portland

Proposed Amendments to RTP Resolution NO. 09-XXXX

Before MPAC

Introduced by Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz

November 18, 2009

EXCERPT FROM RTP RESOLUTION

Amend:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

4. Direct Metro staff to: A. Prepare a technical memorandum explaining the methodology for projecting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the 2035 RTP B. Have an expert in the field review the methodology and suggest improvements C. During the period that Metro staff is conducting the air quality conformity analysis (January – February 2010), re-run the GHG projections using the improved methodology D. With the improved GHG projection results and assuming that the GHG performance targets for the region are not met, conduct further analysis to determine which projects have the most significant adverse impact on GHG emissions E. Report these findings to JPACT and consider changes to the project list during the public comment period (March – April 2010)

Explanation:

4. The direction to Metro staff above provides a process for improving the GHG projections and better understanding how certain transportation investments may adversely affect our ability to meet regional GHG reduction targets. Amendment 4 above is not requesting a project by project assessment, only adjustments to GHG modeling made to a point at which GHG performance by project category may be shown.

Proposed order of business for adoption of the Urban Growth Report (UGR) Resolution by MPAC

1. Andy Cotugno: Provide an **overview of the UGR legislation** MPAC is requested to take action on **and the order of business today.**
 - **Grey** printed materials in the packet include:
 - A transmittal memo from Malu Wilkinson.
 - The UGR Resolution proposed for adoption by the Metro Council for which an MPAC recommendation is requested.
 - A request from the City of Portland for a proposed amendment to the Resolution relating to the Housing Needs analysis.
 - A letter signed by the Mayors of Hillsboro, Beaverton and Sherwood and the Chair of the Washington County Commission to expand the range of the population and employment forecast.
 - A memo from staff outlining a proposed amendment on the need for large lot industrial sites.
2. We will ask to put the **main motion** on the table.
3. Staff will then **recap** the elements being adopted by the Resolution.
4. Then the **City of Portland** will be afforded an opportunity to move their amendment relating to the Housing Needs Analysis. The Committee will be provided an opportunity to discuss and then action will be sought on the amendment.
5. Then the members from **Hillsboro, Beaverton, Sherwood and Washington County** will be afforded an opportunity to move their amendment relating to the population and employment forecast range. The Committee will be provided an opportunity to discuss and then action will be sought on the amendment.
6. Then staff will introduce the amendment to the need for **large lot industrial land** proposed at the MPAC retreat on October 23. The Committee will be asked for a motion/second to amend; provided an opportunity to discuss and then action will be sought on the amendment.
7. Then MPAC members will be asked if there are any other proposed amendments. As needed, they should be taken up.
8. Then, the overall **Resolution, as amended** will be up for approval.

2. Chair Shane Bemis: Ask for a motion/second to recommend adoption of the **main UGR Resolution**.
This puts the main motion on the table.
3. Staff will then **recap** the elements being adopted by the Resolution, including:
 - The 20 and 50 year population and employment forecast;
 - The conclusion that there is a 26,100 to 103,600 dwelling unit gap in meeting the need for housing within the existing UGB;
 - The conclusion that there no gap in meeting the need for general industrial land;
 - The conclusion that there is a gap of approximately 1000 acres in meeting the need for general non-industrial land at the high end of the forecast and no gap at the low end of the forecast.
 - The conclusion that there is a gap of 200-800 acres in meeting the need for large lot industrial land.
4. Chair: The City of Portland should be afforded an opportunity to move their amendment to the Resolution relating to the **Housing Needs Analysis**.
Call for a second.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
5. Chair: The representatives for the Cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Sherwood and Washington County should be afforded an opportunity to move their amendment to the Resolution relating to the **population and employment forecast range**.
Call for a second.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
6. Staff will introduce the proposed amendment to increase the need for **large lot industrial sites** from 200-800 to 200-1500 acres.
Chair: Ask for a motion/second to amend the Resolution to revise the need for large lot industrial.
Facilitate discussion by the Committee.
Call the question to either approve or disapprove the proposed amendment.
7. Chair: Any additional amendments from members should be asked for and taken up as needed.
8. Chair: Ask for **final action** to approve or disapprove the main UGR Resolution as amended.



Date: November 10, 2009 **REVISED, 11/13/09**
To: MPAC
From: Malu Wilkinson, UGR Project Manager
Re: MPAC recommendation on the 2009 Urban Growth Report

At its November 18, 2009 meeting, MPAC will be asked to make a recommendation to the Metro Council on whether to accept the population and employment forecast and the urban growth report as reasonable and complete. That Metro Council action will take the form of consideration of a resolution (included in packet) in December 2009. In order to facilitate MPAC's deliberation, Metro staff has articulated several questions for MPAC to consider:

ACTION ITEM: Does MPAC recommend that the Metro Council vote in favor of the resolution?

Specifically,

1. Does MPAC find the following analyses to be reasonable and complete?
 - The 2030 population and employment forecast
 - The UGR's assessment of residential demand and capacity that there is a gap of 26,000 to 103,600 dwelling units
 - The UGR's assessment of general, non-industrial demand and capacity that there is a gap of 1000 acres at the high and of the forecast and zero at the low end
 - The UGR's assessment of general, industrial demand and capacity that there is no gap
 - The UGR's assessment of large lot employment demand and capacity (*or, does MPAC recommend the amendment of the UGR's assessment of large employment lot need from a range of 200 – 800 acres to a range of 200 – 1,500 acres, as described in an October 26, 2009 memo from Malu Wilkinson to MPAC?*)
2. Does MPAC recommend amendment of the resolution to specifically mention the housing needs analysis (*language as proposed by the City of Portland at the October 28, 2009 MPAC meeting*)?
3. Does MPAC recommend amendment of the resolution on the population and employment forecast range (as proposed by the Cities of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Sherwood and Washington County)?

UGR-related materials in packet

To facilitate MPAC's deliberation, Metro staff has included a number of items in the MPAC packet. MPAC has previously seen all of these items at recent meetings. These items include:

- A draft resolution for consideration by the Metro Council

- Proposed amendment to the resolution drafted by the City of Portland (regarding the housing needs analysis)
- October 28, 2009 letter to Michael Jordan from the Mayors of Hillsboro, Beaverton, Sherwood and Washington County Commission Chair regarding an amendment to the population and employment forecast range.
- October 26, 2009 memo to MPAC from Malu Wilkinson regarding a proposed amendment to the UGR's assessment of large lot employment need



October 28, 2009

Michael Jordan
Chief Operating Office
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232

RE: Proposed Amendments Resolution No. 09-xxxx - For the Purpose of Accepting the Population and Employment Forecasts and the Urban Growth Report as Support for Determination of Capacity of the Urban Growth Boundary

Dear Mr. Jordan:

Our simple request is to considerably expand the range of population and employment forecast as part of the Urban Growth Report process. Please have your staff prepare an amendment(s) for consideration by MPAC and the Metro Council.

Given the staff proposal involves consideration of a range of forecasts for population and employment needs determination, expanding the range for both population and employment will remain constant with the prevailing Metro approach.

Expansion of the needs range in the proposed Resolution will allow Metro to meet its state law requirement to determine need by December 2009. More significantly, it will allow MPAC and Metro additional time to more carefully review the Urban Growth Reports and its various assumptions.

Metro has heard from numerous reviewers that 30 days to review 1700 pages is simply too little time. The same is true for MPAC and certainly the local governments of Washington County. Expansion of the need ranges will allow all to legitimately continue the review into year 2010.

We have previously requested from Mr. Andy Cotugno additional analysis and information on a number of Urban Growth Report matters. Understandably, the short amount of time has not allowed Mr. Cotugno to prepare such requested analyses and certainly did not provide MPAC or the local governments of Washington County time to fully discuss such analyses or consider alternatives to the myriad of critical technical/policy assumptions with the Urban Growth Report.

We remain extremely concerned about the background and content within the Urban Growth Report regarding, for instance, the following issues:

1. Existing Zoned Capacity
2. Capture Rate
3. Refill Rate
4. Average dwelling unit density for additions to the UGB
5. UGR Industrial Trends vs. Local Government EDA results
6. Large Industrial Lots issue

Board of County Commissioners

155 North First Avenue, Suite 300, MS 22, Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072
phone: (503) 846-8681 • fax: (503) 846-4545

Michael Jordan
October 27, 2009
Page 2

Please provide for flexibility in the Urban Growth Report such that Metro and its local government partners and the business community have sufficient time to continue this important discussion early in 2010. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,




Tom Brian
Chairman
Washington County Board of Commissioners
MPAC Chairman



Jerry Willey
Mayor of Hillsboro
MPAC Representative



Denny Doyle
Mayor of Beaverton
MPAC Representative



Keith Mays
Mayor of Sherwood
MPAC Representative

c: Andy Cotugno

PROJECTED NUMBER OF SITES DEMANDED

The final step in establishing the City's land demand projections is to arrive at the number of sites expected to be demanded according to the above described development pattern types during the planning horizon. Because there are subjective components to this analysis, it is important to understand basic assumptions utilized in the analysis. **The principal assumptions relate to methodology for identifying and categorizing medium and large sites and these include the following:**

- **The vast proportion of the employment land base, from the standpoint of total acreage, is consumed by sites larger than half an acre.** Some of these are held for speculation and will be divided further, but the vast majority of these parcels are developed and used by going concerns.
- **It is much easier to divide employment land into small parcels to meet the needs of smaller users than it is to aggregate small parcels in fractured ownerships to meet the needs of a larger user.**

In estimating employment site demand, no single, simple methodology was utilized for estimating Hillsboro need for industrial land by parcel size and quality. **Industry-specific and even firm-specific needs indicate an even more diverse range of requirements for known and likely future industries.** Accordingly, JOHNSON REID utilized all of the following to identify likely site requirements for parcel size distribution in the context of physical site requirements by general use type summarized in the Development Type Pattern Matrices:

- *Economic Stakeholder Outreach:* Emphasis was put on flexible land supply to accommodate long-term investment decisions by “anchor” cluster firms (SolarWorld, Genentech, Intel). These larger, key industry firms’ commitment to an economic area then attract various ripple effects via spin-offs, joint ventures, competitors, suppliers, and customers typically utilizing more moderate parcel sizes highly proximate to the “anchor” firm. Intel’s Jones Farm and Ronler Acres are examples of employment ripple effect and spin-off well documented by Joe Cortright/Impresa Consulting and the Portland State University Institute of Metropolitan Studies. Input also emphasized flexibility regarding development orientation. Large firms land bank and build larger, more flexible structures to allow for modification of research and manufacturing process, as well as changes in product lines.
- *Industry-Specific Literature Review:* Industry studies and documents were utilized to understand likely parcel sizes required of emerging high technology-dependent firms and clusters based on operations standards and site investments elsewhere.
- *OECD Industrial Site/Shovel Ready Guidelines:* Parcel quality and infrastructure need as documented by OECD for statewide industry recruitment with sector specifics also utilized for pertinent industries.
- *City of Hillsboro Planning Documents:* Plans and analysis in support of the Shute Road Industrial Site comprehensive plan amendment, as well findings from the Evergreen Concept Plan and Helvetia Concept Plan were utilized.
- *Industrial Development Standards:* NAIOP, among others, indicate design and size standards for industrial development utilized by multiple users instead of “anchor” single users, i.e. business, industrial, and flex park development.
- *U.S. Census of Business:* Washington County zip codes 97123 and 97124 data for distribution of firms by industry and employment were utilized to assist in distribution of need by industry type.
- *Professional Experience:* As a due diligence and feasibility service provider to industrial development throughout the Pacific Northwest, JOHNSON REID experience for private and public interests (Portland Development Commission, et al.) was also utilized.

Figure 27 provides a detailed assessment of Hillsboro **employment land demand through 2035 in terms number of sites demanded by site size**, with a comparison to developable employment land supply by site quality within the existing Hillsboro urban growth boundary. Results are expressed for all three employment growth scenarios.

FIGURE 27: RECONCILIATION OF HILLSBORO EMPLOYMENT LAND SITE DEMAND & SUPPLY (2035)

2035 Land Demand Reconciliation - Site Need Count									
Number of Sites by Development Pattern						Planning Horizon			
	Typical Acreage	Demand Projections - Sites				Vacant Supply (Sites)	Balance - Sites Needed		
		Baseline	High	Medium	Baseline		High	Medium	
Office	Business Park	50.0	4	12	9	-	4	12	9
	Medium	25.0	5	16	12	1.0	4	15	11
	Small	5.0	25	80	64	30.0	(5)	50	34
	SubTotal		33	108	86	31.0	7	77	55
Industrial	Cluster Anchor	100.0+	4	10	7	3.0	1	7	4
	Anchor or Large Park	50.0 - 100.0	3	6	4	3.0	(0)	3	1
	Large User or Mid Park	25.0 - 50.0	7	15	11	7.0	(0)	8	4
	Medium User or Smaller Park	10.0 - 25.0	13	29	21	13.0	0	16	8
	Expanding User	5.0 - 10.0	14	31	22	25.0	(11)	6	(3)
	Small Businesses	5.0 or fewer	91	202	146	118.0	(27)	84	28
	SubTotal		132	293	212	169.0	2	124	46
Commercial Retail	Large	25.0	10	20	17	-	10	20	17
	Medium	10.0	55	108	93	1.0	54	107	92
	Small	1.5	243	476	408	73.0	170	403	335
	SubTotal		308	605	517	74.0	234	531	443

Note: Figures may not sum due to rounding.

SOURCE: City of Hillsboro Planning Department and Johnson Reid, LLC

2035 INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT SITE DEMAND FINDINGS

- *Sites Demanded:* Hillsboro economic growth is expected to generate demand for a minimum of 132 industrial sites to as many as 293 over the planning period. The great majority of sites demanded will be five acres or fewer in size (“Small Businesses”), however sizeable shares are attributable to “Expanding Users” (5-10 acres) and “Medium User/Smaller Park” (10-25 acres).
- *Site Supply:* The City of Hillsboro currently has 169 sites suitable for industrial development within its UGB, greatly concentrated in parcels sized five acres or less. Hillsboro currently has some uncommitted, developable industrial sites within its UGB for all categories of site size demand.
- *Sites Needed Reconciliation:* Given documented site demand and existing inventory, Hillsboro will require anywhere from two additional industrial sites (Baseline Scenario) to 124 additional sites (High Growth Scenario) to meet economic opportunities identified in this analysis.
- *Sites Needed Concentration:* Under the conservative Baseline Scenario, Hillsboro will require the addition of land for one site in the “Cluster Anchor” size category, though the sum of site need due to rounding indicates a need for land sufficient for two industrial sites through 2035. Under the two higher growth scenarios, Hillsboro requires the addition of industrial land suitable for nearly all site size categories. It should be underscored that under all growth scenarios, Hillsboro currently has insufficient land for “Cluster Anchor” industrial site demand during the planning period.

Hillsboro Industrial Siting Prospects - 3 Years

PROJECT	LEAST ACRES	MOST ACRES	MONTH	YEAR
Apricus	250	300	12	2007
Tahoe	80	150	9	2007
August	50	100	8	2008
Bright	50	75	11	2008
Sunbelt	50	75	12	2008
Parkway	65	75	3	2009
Hot	75	75	9	2007
Parkway II	65	65	3	2009
Boss	50	60	6	2008
David II	20	50	10	2009
Valencia	40	50	9	2008
Monarch	40	50	10	2008
Reddy	26	40	8	2009
Innovate	15	25	11	2008
SpectraWatt	20	25	12	2008
Edison	25	25		
Harvester	25	25		
Cambridge	10	20	6	2009
Ark	15	20	12	2007
Champion	10	15	6	2009
Wick	6	10	8	2009

Hillsboro Industrial Site Recruitments Over 3 Years

	Least Acres	Max. Acres	Percent
100+ Acres	1	3	14% *
50-99 Acres	8	9	43% *
25-49 Acres	5	5	24%
< 25 Acres	7	4	19%
Total Sites	21	21	100%

**57% of total site inquiries for parcels over 50 acres in size*

Source: City of Hillsboro Eco Dev Dept. - Oct 2009



DRAFT
City of Portland

Proposed Amendment to UGR Resolution NO. 09-XXXX

Introduced by Mayor Sam Adams and Commissioner Amanda Fritz
November 18, 2009

New “WHEREAS”:

“WHEREAS, the region has an interest in an adequate supply of land appropriate for industries that prefer larger parcels near transportation facilities and an interest in efficient use of existing transportation facilities; and

Amend: “BE IT RESOLVED” 1 as follows:

1. The Council accepts the “20 and 50 year Regional population and employment forecasts” dated December __, 2009, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit A, as a basis for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 and for actions the Council will take to add capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14, and directs the staff to work with MPAC to identify opportunities for industries that prefer large parcels, with a priority to brownfields and assembly of smaller parcels inside the existing UGB.

Explanation:

The COO’s UGR Recommendation has identified the potential need for large parcels for certain industries. The location of many brownfield sites have been identified and are located near important regional transportation facilities (air, marine, rail, and freight). When cleaned up, these sites offer many land use efficiencies and strategic economic advantages for the region and for those industries seeking large parcels. Recapturing these lands and assembling these and other smaller parcels offers important regionally significant economic advantages. The region should make brownfield clean-up a regional policy priority.



Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009
To: MPAC Members, Alternates and Interested Parties
From: Kelsey Newell
Subject: 2010 MPAC meeting schedule

Please mark your calendars for the following 2010 MPAC meeting dates. MPAC meetings are scheduled from 5 to 7 p.m. in the Metro Council Chambers.

Wednesday, January 13, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, January 27, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, February 10, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, February 24, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, March 10, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, March 24, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, April 14, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, April 28, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, May 12, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, May 26, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, June 9, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, June 23, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, July 14, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, July 28, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, August 11, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, August 25, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, September 8, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, September 22, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, October 13, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, October 27, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, November 10, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, November 17, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, December 8, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting
Wednesday, December 22, 2010	Regular MPAC meeting