




METRO

DATE: December 17, 2001

TO: JPACT Members
JPACT Alternates
JPACT Interested Parties

FROM: Renée Castilla, Administrative Assistant 

RE: **Next JPACT Meeting – January 10, 2002**

.....

The next meeting of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) has been rescheduled from January 17, 2002 to January 10, 2002. The meeting will be held in Metro conference rooms 370 A & B at 7:30 a.m.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (503) 797-1916.

Thank you.



METRO

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

REVISED

MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

DATE: Thursday, December 11, 2003

TIME: 7:15 A.M.

PLACE: Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

- | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| 7:15 | Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum | Councilor Rod Park, Chair |
| 7:15 | Citizen communications to JPACT on non-agenda items | Councilor Rod Park, Chair |
| 7:20 | Resolution 04-3400 For the Purpose of Finalizing the Decision to Add the Portland Mall Alignment to the Locally Preferred Alternative for Phase 1 of the South Corridor Light Rail Project, and; Resolution 03-3372 For the Purpose of Amending The South/North Land Use Final Order, To Add the I-205 and Portland Mall Light Rail Alignments, Revise the Milwaukie Light Rail Alignment and Revise the Interstate MAX Alignment to Reflect Final Design and Construction. | Richard Brandman (Metro) Ross Roberts (Metro) |
| New agenda item | | |
| 7:25 | 2004 Regional Transportation Plan • Ordinance No. 03-1024 For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Functional Plan for Transportation to Meet State Planning Requirements – <u>PROPOSAL TO WITHDRAW REQUESTED</u> * • Resolution No. 03-3380 For the Purpose of Designation of the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to meet Federal Planning Requirements – <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u> • Resolution No. 03-3382 For the Purpose of Adopting the Portland Area Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan and 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program – <u>CONTINUED TO JANUARY 15, 2004</u> | Andy Cotugno (Metro) Tom Kloster (Metro) Kim Ellis (Metro) |
| 7:50 | * 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) – <u>ADOPTION REQUESTED</u> ▪ Resolution No. 03-3381 For the purpose of Approving the 2004-07 MTIP for the Portland Metropolitan Area ▪ Resolution No. 03-3398 For the Purpose of Amending the 2002-05 MTIP to Add Funding of Preliminary Engineering of the Highway 217 Widening Project. ▪ Resolution No. 03-3399 For the Purpose of Amending the 2002-05 MTIP to Include Funding of Five Projects; Highway 43 Turn Refuges, Highway 30 Safety Improvements, Union Station Improvements, Tualatin River Bike/Bed Bridge, and Hillsboro Regional Center Pedestrian Improvements | Andy Cotugno (Metro) Ted Leybold (Metro) |
| 8:10 | * Resolution No. 04-3400 For the Purpose of Adopting the Regional Travel Options (RTO) 5-Year Strategic Plan - <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u> | Andy Cotugno (Metro) Bill Barber (Metro) |
| 8:25 | # Comments on ODOT Administrative Rule Relating to Special Transportation Areas – <u>APPROVAL REQUESTED</u> | Andy Cotugno (Metro) Kim Ellis (Metro) |
| 8:35 | JPACT Retreat - <u>DISCUSSION</u> | Councilor Rod Park/Chair |
| 8:50 | * TEA - 21 Reauthorization - <u>INFORMATIONAL</u> ▪ Senate Bill 1072 ▪ House Bill 3550 ▪ House Bill XXXX - Congestion Relief Act ▪ Comparison of Funding levels | Andy Cotugno (Metro) |
| 9:00 | ADJOURN | Councilor Rod Park/Chair |

* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy

** Not all material on this agenda item is available electronically.

Material provided at meeting.

All material will be available at the meeting.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINALIZING THE |) | RESOLUTION NO. 04 - 3403 |
| DECISION TO ADD THE PORTLAND MALL |) | |
| ALIGNMENT TO THE LOCALLY PREFERRED |) | Introduced by Councilor Brian Newman |
| ALTERNATIVE FOR PHASE I OF THE SOUTH |) | |
| CORRIDOR LIGHT RAIL PROJECT |) | |

WHEREAS, The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Metro published the South/North Corridor Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in February 1998, that evaluated several alternatives in the South/North Corridor; and

WHEREAS, On July 23, 1998 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 98-2674 defining the Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS) and Resolution No. 98-2673 adopting the Land Use Final Order (LUFO) for the South/North Project; and

WHEREAS, FTA and Metro published the South/North Supplemental DEIS (SDEIS) in June 1999, amended the South/North LPS in June 1999 by adopting Resolution No. 99-2806A that defined the Interstate MAX Project as the first construction segment in the South/North Corridor and published the North Corridor Interstate MAX Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in October 1999; and

WHEREAS, In June 1999 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 99-2795A that refocused the region's attention on the southern portion of the South/North Corridor and initiated the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study; and

WHEREAS, FTA, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Metro published the South Corridor SDEIS on December 20, 2002 that evaluated a number of alternatives in the South Corridor and on April 17, 2003 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 03-3303 that amended the LPA to include a two phased approach to the South Corridor with the I-205 and downtown segments as the first phase and the Milwaukie segment as the second phase; and

WHEREAS, The FTA required that the downtown segment of the LPA be defined as "preliminary" until the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) evaluation and analysis was updated for the Portland Mall Alignment; and

WHEREAS, FTA, FHWA and Metro published the Downtown Portland Amendment to the South Corridor Project SDEIS in October 2003 and the public was invited to comment on the Amendment until November 17, 2003; and

WHEREAS, The public comments received on the downtown Amendment to the SDEIS were received by Metro staff and compiled in the Public Comment Report, published on November 19, 2003; and

WHEREAS, The Mayor's Committee, the South Corridor Steering Committee, the TriMet Board of Directors and the City of Portland have reviewed the NEPA document and the public comments and made recommendations to the Metro Council as reflected in the Amendment to the Locally Preferred Alternative Report dated.... and attached to this resolution; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council hereby; adopts the amendment to the LPA as described in the South Corridor Project Downtown Portland Mall Segment Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation report (Exhibit A) and generally includes extending Light Rail Transit from the Steel

Bridge to Union Station and then on 5th and 6th Avenues along the Portland Transit Mall to the Portland State University Terminus at SW Jackson Street,

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 8th day of January, 2003

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE |) | |
| SOUTH/NORTH LAND USE FINAL ORDER, TO |) | |
| INCLUDE THE TWO PHASES OF THE SOUTH |) | RESOLUTION NO. 03-3372 |
| CORRIDOR PROJECT CONSISTING OF THE |) | |
| ADDITION OF THE I-205 LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT |) | |
| PROJECT FROM GATEWAY TO CLACKAMAS |) | |
| REGIONAL CENTER WITH THE DOWNTOWN |) | Introduced by: |
| PORTLAND TRANSIT MALL ALIGNMENT, AND |) | |
| MODIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED LIGHT RAIL |) | |
| BETWEEN DOWNTOWN PORTLAND AND |) | COUNCILOR NEWMAN |
| MILWAUKIE, DELETION OF PLANS TO EXTEND |) | |
| LIGHT RAIL FROM MILWAUKIE TO |) | |
| CLACKAMAS REGIONAL CENTER AND TO |) | |
| REFLECT THE FINAL INTERSTATE MAX |) | |
| DESIGN. |) | |
| |) | |

WHEREAS, the Oregon Legislature enacted Oregon Laws 1996, Chapter 12 (the Act) establishing procedures for siting the South/North Light Rail Project through adoption by the Metro Council of a Land Use Final Order (LUFO) following application by Tri-Met; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 4 of the Act, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission, following a public hearing, adopted the South/North Project land use final order criteria on May 30, 1996; and

WHEREAS, a plan for the South/North Light Rail Project was prepared and, in compliance with the Act, on July 2, 1998, TriMet applied for a corresponding land use final order; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, after public notice and public hearing, concluded that the TriMet LUFO application met all requirements of the Act, including the criteria, and adopted Resolution No. 98-2673, the South/North Land Use Final Order, and

WHEREAS, in 1999, the Interstate MAX design and alignment was proposed and an amendment to the South/North Land Use Final Order was requested by a second application by TriMet and the Metro Council, after public notice, a public hearing and consideration of the criteria and facts, concluded that the application met all requirements of the Act and adopted Resolution 99-2853A, the North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project Final Land Use Order; and

WHEREAS, extensive analysis was completed in the South Corridor Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), published on December 20, 2002, which evaluated a no-build alternative, a Bus Rapid Transit Alternative, a Busway Alternative, a Milwaukie Light Rail Alternative, an I-205 Light Rail Alternative and a Combined Light Rail Alternative along with various design options; and

WHEREAS, the public was invited to comment on the SDEIS during the public comment period from December 20, 2002 through February 7, 2003, and comments received during the comment period, including at two public hearings, are documented in the South Corridor Project Public Comment Report (February 2003); and

WHEREAS, the South Corridor Policy Committee reviewed the SDEIS, considered the public comments and adopted a recommendation to amend the South/North LPS through a two-phased major transit investment strategy for the South Corridor, with the I-205 Light Rail Project as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for Phase 1 and the Milwaukie LRT for Phase 2; and

WHEREAS, the local jurisdictions in the South Corridor reviewed the Policy Committee's recommendations for a two-phased approach, including the I-205 and Milwaukie light rail transit (LRT) projects and the TriMet Board, ODOT, and the local jurisdictions each adopted a resolution supporting these recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council, after public notice and holding a public hearing adopted Resolution No. 03-3303, amending the Locally Preferred Alternative to include Phase 1, the I-205 LRT project from Gateway to Clackamas regional center, including LRT along the downtown Portland transit mall, and a Phase 2 project extending LRT from downtown Portland to Milwaukie; and,

WHEREAS, a *Downtown Amendment to the South Corridor Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (ASDEIS)* was published on October 2003, the public was invited to comment on the ASDEIS during the public comment period from October 3, 2003 through November 17, 2003, and the comments received during the public comment period and a public hearing before the Mayor's Task Force and South Corridor Policy Committee on October 21, 2003 are documented in the LRT on the Downtown Transit Mall Public Comment Report dated November, 2003; and

WHEREAS, on November 24, 2003, the LUFO Steering Committee recommended to TriMet a LUFO amendment that establishes light rail routes, stations and park-and-ride lots as described in Locally Preferred Alternative described in Resolution No. 03-3303 and adopted by the Metro Council on April 17, 2003, as well as amendments showing LRT on the Downtown Portland Transit Mall and amendments that reflect final engineering changes constructed in the Interstate MAX LRT segment and deletion of plans to extend LRT from Milwaukie to the Clackamas Regional Center; and

WHEREAS, in a letter dated November 24, 2003 from Matthew Garrett, representing the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), recommended to TriMet the same LUFO amendment as was recommended by the LUFO Steering Committee; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2003, following consideration of the recommendations from the LUFO Steering Committee and the Oregon Department of Transportation, TriMet submitted to Metro its application for an amendment of the land use final order consistent with the recommendations of the LUFO Steering Committee and ODOT; and

WHEREAS, the light rail route, stations and lot locations in TriMet's application are in the form of boundaries within which the light rail route, stations and lots shall be located, as provided for in Section 6(1)(a) of the Act; and

WHEREAS, following receipt of TriMet's application, public notice of a January 8, 2004 public hearing to consider Tri-Met's application was published on December 12, 2003 in the Oregonian, which the Metro Council finds to be a newspaper of general circulation within Metro's jurisdictional area, and that this public notice was published more than the fourteen days prior to the January 8, 2004 public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the above-identified notice contains all of the information required by Section 7(1)(b) of the Act to be included in the Metro Council's published notice of this LUFO amendment proceeding; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council provided additional public notice of the January 8, 2004 public hearing by mailing a notices to Clackamas and Multnomah counties, the cities of Portland, Milwaukie, Gladstone, and Oregon City; and the Oregon Department of Transportation and by posting this information on TriMet's and Metro's web pages, mailing notices to interested parties and to property owners within 100 feet of proposed changes to the past LUFO decisions; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council finds and determines that the above-described required published notice along with earlier notices provided to interested parties during the draft environmental impact statement process is reasonable notice calculated to give notice to persons who may be substantially affected by its decision on the proposed LUFO amendment; and

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2003, a copy of the staff report, identifying and addressing compliance with the applicable South/North land use criteria and also including a description of the proposed boundaries within which the light rail route, stations and lots are proposed to be located, was made available for public inspection; and

WHEREAS, on January 8, 2004, the Metro Council held a public hearing at which it accepted oral and written public testimony on TriMet's application for a LUFO amendment as described in these recitals; and

WHEREAS, at the January 8, 2004 public hearing the Council commenced the hearing by making a statement containing the information identified in Section 7(3) of the Act pertaining to the criteria, location of light rail, appeals and record requirements and other provisions of the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has considered Tri-Met's application, the recommendations of the LUFO Steering Committee and ODOT, the staff report and the testimony provided in support of, or in opposition to TriMet's application; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has an interest in improving the LRT connections between Clackamas regional center and Gateway, along the Portland Transit Mall and between Milwaukie and downtown Portland, now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Metro Council hereby adopts the Land Use Final Order amendment of the South/North Light Rail Project and the North Corridor Interstate MAX Light Rail Project as attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by this reference, amending the light rail route, stations and lots, including their locations. As indicated in Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, the South/North LUFO amendment hereby adopted by the Metro Council is identical to the LUFO amendment application submitted by TriMet.

2. That the Metro Council finds that the South/North Land Use Final Order, as amended, is consistent with Metro Council policies and regulations including the latest adopted versions of the *Regional Framework Plan*, *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*, *2000 Regional Transportation Plan* and the *Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan*.

3. That the Metro Council hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in support of the Land Use Final Order Amendment, attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by this reference, as its written findings of fact demonstrating how the Metro Council's decision in its adopted Land Use Final Order amendment comply with the applicable review criteria.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 2004

David Bragdon, President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DESIGNATION OF) RESOLUTION NO. 03-3380A
THE 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION)
PLAN AS THE FEDERAL METROPOLITAN)
TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO MEET) Introduced by Councilor Park
FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS)

WHEREAS, federal law requires Metro to demonstrate every three years that its Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") conforms to the Clean Air Act; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Transportation (Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency last found the RTP to conform to the requirements of the Clean Air Act on January 26, 2001; and

WHEREAS, federal transportation planning rules require Metro, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization ("MPO"), to identify a MPO Planning Boundary; and

WHEREAS, a post-adoption air quality analysis must demonstrate conformity with the federal Clean Air Act for continued federal certification; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has received and considered the advice of its Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and its Metro Policy Advisory Committee, and all proposed amendments identified in Exhibit "A" have been the subject of a ~~30-day~~ public review period that began October 31, 2003, and ended December 10, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Council held a public hearing on the 2004 RTP on December ~~11~~ 4, 2003; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. The 2004 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), ~~adopted by the Council in Ordinance No. 03-1024~~, shall be the federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
2. The map in Part 1 (Policy Update) of the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Update, ~~adopted by the Council in Ordinance No. 03-1024~~, shall be the Metropolitan Planning Organization Planning Area Boundary for purposes of the federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

3. The Chief Operating Officer shall revise the 2004 RTP, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit A (Parts 1, 2, and 3), as recommended by the Transportation Planning Advisory Committee to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee in "Summary of Public Comments: Receive October 31, 2003 through December 4, 2003," dated December 5, 2003, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit B, and in "Supplemental Public Comments: Received December 5, 2003 through December 10, 2003," dated December 11, 2003, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit C.

34. The Chief Operating Officer shall submit this resolution, and the 2004 RTP and Resolution No. 03-3382 (the 2004 RTP/2004-07 MTIP Air Quality Conformity Determination as set forth in Part 4 (Air Quality Conformity), of Exhibit A upon its adoption by the Council, to the U.S. Department of Transportation (Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency prior to January 26, 2004, for review for acknowledgement that these documents conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act prior to January 26, 2004.

4. ~~The Findings of Compliance in Exhibit B, attached and incorporated into this resolution, explain how the 2004 RTP conforms to the requirements of the Clean Air Act and federal planning requirements.~~

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ____ day of December 2003.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3380A, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS THE FEDERAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO MEET FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: December 10, 2003

Prepared by: Kim Ellis

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would adopt the 2004 Federal update to the Regional Transportation Plan ("Federal RTP") as the federal metropolitan transportation plan and would bring the RTP into compliance with the Clean Air Act and federal planning requirements, pending approval of Resolution No. 03-3382 (the 2004 RTP/2004-07 MTIP Air Quality Conformity Determination). Metro is not required to update the regional transportation plan for state planning purposes until 2007.

The Federal RTP, included as Exhibit "A," contains:

- Policy Packet (Part 1) – Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) presents the overall policy framework for specific transportation policies, objectives and actions identified throughout this plan. It also sets a direction for future planning and decision-making by the Metro Council and the implementing agencies, counties and cities.

The Policy Packet includes the proposed policy amendments for the Federal RTP, which includes changes to several transportation system maps in Chapter 1 and changes to Chapter 1 policy text to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and funding. The updated system maps include a number of "housekeeping" amendments that reflect fine-tuning of the various modal system maps. Many of these amendments were recommended by local cities and counties as part of local transportation plans adopted since the last RTP update in August 2000. In addition, a new map that identifies the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Planning Boundary is proposed to be added to Chapter 1 of the RTP. This boundary defines the area that the Regional Transportation Plan applies to for federal planning purposes.

- Project Packet (Part 2) - The Project Packet includes an updated Financially Constrained System that will be eligible for state and federal funding and a larger "Illustrative System" that identifies the 20-year transportation needs for the region. As the federally recognized system, the financially constrained system is also the source of transportation projects that may be funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. This packet incorporates new projects recommended in local transportation plans or corridor studies adopted since 2000 and endorsed by Metro as "friendly amendments" as part of the local review process. The updated financially constrained system is required for federal planning purposes, serves as the basis for a conformity determination with the federal Clean Air Act that will be addressed through a separate Resolution No. 03-3382. Projects that have been added to the Federal RTP and that are not included in the 2000 RTP priority system would require compliance with statewide planning goals through a separate amendment to the 2000 RTP Priority System prior to construction,
- Technical Packet (Part 3) - The Technical Packet incorporates technical changes to the Chapter 6 of the RTP that delete technical requirements that have been addressed through recently adopted

corridor studies and frame future work that must still be completed as part of future updates to the Federal RTP.

EXISTING LAW

Metro is required to complete a periodic update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in order to maintain continued compliance with the federal Clean Air Act. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved and acknowledged the 2000 RTP air quality conformity determination on January 26, 2001. Under federal regulations, the RTP must be updated every three years to ensure that the plan adequately addresses future travel needs and is consistent with the federal Clean Air Act. As a result, a new plan demonstrating conformity with the Clean Air Act must be approved and acknowledged by US DOT and US EPA in a formal conformity determination by January 26, 2004, when the current US DOT/US EPA conformity determination for the 2000 RTP expires. If the conformity determination expires, the plan is considered to “lapse,” meaning that federally-funded transportation improvements could not be obligated during the lapse period. This consequence would apply to engineering, right-of-way acquisition or construction of any federally funded or permitted transportation project, except those defined as exempt because they do not have the possibility of increasing vehicle emissions.

Because the 2000 RTP was the result of a major update and was completed relatively recently, the Federal update to the RTP represents a minor effort that was limited to meeting state and federal requirements, and incorporating new policy direction set by Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council as part of various corridor and special studies adopted since 2000. The update also incorporated a number of “friendly amendments” proposed as part of local transportation plans adopted since 2000.

In addition, federal transportation planning rules require Metro, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (“MPO”), to identify a MPO Planning Area Boundary. This boundary defines the area that the Regional Transportation Plan applies to for federal planning purposes. The boundary includes the area inside Metro's jurisdictional boundary, the urban growth boundary and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. A new map has been added to chapter 1 of the RTP to meet this requirement.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The most pressing need for this update to the RTP is continued compliance with the federal Clean Air Act. Most of the federal requirements only required minor revisions to the RTP in order to maintain compliance. The more involved efforts involve the requirement for a “financially constrained” plan and demonstration of conformity with the federal Clean Air Act. The conformity finding is based on the projects that make up the “financially constrained” plan. The financial constraint exercise consists of developing a projection of reasonably expected transportation funding over the 20-year plan period, and selecting a subset of projects from the plan that fit within this “constraint.” The financially constrained system of projects is then evaluated to determine whether implementation of the projects would violate the federal Clean Air Act.

In October 2003, Metro staff worked with members of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and other interested parties to develop a comprehensive inventory of regional transportation projects identified in local plans and special studies adopted since the 2000 RTP was completed in order to update the 2000 RTP project list. This inventory included:

- new projects or studies that are not currently in the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, but that have been adopted in local transportation system plans (TSPs) and regional corridor studies through a public process
- updates to existing 2000 RTP projects or studies to reflect changes in project location, description, cost and recommended timing

Nearly all city and county transportation plans in the Metro region have been updated during the past three years to be consistent with the 2000 RTP. In the process of completing these updates, many local plans identified new transportation projects of regional significance that are proposed as part of the draft Federal RTP as amendments. Some corridor studies that have been completed (or are nearing completion) since the last RTP update in August 2000 have been endorsed by resolution with the expectation that the new projects generated by these studies would be incorporated into the current RTP update. This includes the Powell/Foster Corridor Study, Phase 1.

Finally, the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, Powell Boulevard Streetscape Study and the McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancement Plan were completed in 2003 with the expectation that new projects generated by these local planning efforts would be incorporated into the Federal RTP. The recommendations endorsed in each of these efforts are also reflected Federal RTP.

The updated “Illustrative System” of projects served as the basis for defining an updated financially constrained system of improvements that represents a subset of roughly half of the Illustrative system. Development of the financially constrained system followed the basic principles of (a) maintaining the Region 2040 Plan policy emphasis of the 2000 RTP by focusing improvements in areas that serve as the economic engines for the region, including centers, ports and industrial areas, and (b) maintaining a similar project balance among travel modes, including roads, transit, bikeways, pedestrian improvements and other project categories.

The Federal RTP provides an updated set of financially constrained projects and programs for future MTIP allocations and is anticipated to meet the federal clean air act. As the federally recognized system, the financially constrained system is also the source of transportation projects that may be funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The MTIP allocates federal funds in the region, and is updated every two years, and includes a rolling, four-year program of transportation improvements.

Technical Considerations

Because of the inherent time and resource constraints, a single round of modeling and analysis was utilized for this update. The principal purpose for this approach was to complete the federal air quality conformity analysis required to demonstrate that the updated plan is consistent with the region’s air quality maintenance plan.

To achieve this, the Federal RTP update combined the preferred and priority systems contained in the 2000 RTP as a single “Illustrative” system that established the universe of projects eligible for inclusion in the financially constrained system that is eligible for federal funding. Exceptions to this guideline were local and regional projects identified in corridor refinements and local transportation plans since the 2000 RTP was adopted. This approach focused TPAC’s activities on defining the financially constrained system, and was based on the assumption that the combination of “Illustrative” system projects from the existing plan, and new projects from subsequent studies, will be adequate to meet travel demand in the new 2025 horizon year.

The Federal RTP did not include an iterative process of multiple rounds of modeling to test new projects against the congestion management system and other RTP performance measures.

In addition to updating transportation projects and growth forecasts, Metro must demonstrate that the Federal RTP meets federal and state air quality analysis requirements. During November and December, Metro completed a technical analysis known as air quality conformity.

The results of the Federal RTP update work tasks are included in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Public Comment document, which is included as Exhibit "A" (Parts 1, 2 and 3). A public comment period was held from October 31, 2003 through December 10, 2003. The Metro Council held a public hearing on Dec. 4, 2003. Exhibit "B" includes a "Summary of Public Comments: Receive October 31, 2003 through December 4, 2003," dated December 5, 2003. Exhibit "C" includes a "Supplemental Public Comments: Received December 5, 2003 through December 10, 2003," dated December 11, 2003.

The Metro Council is being asked to approve Exhibit A as amended by Exhibit "B" and "C" and direct this resolution, the updated Federal RTP and Resolution 03-3382 upon its adoption by the Metro Council be submitted to the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency prior to January 26, 2004 for review for acknowledgement that these documents conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

None known. The region is and has been in compliance with the Clean Air Act since 1996. The Federal RTP financially constrained system of transportation improvements is anticipated to meet federal clean air act requirements.

2. Legal Antecedents

There are a wide variety of past Federal, State and regional legal actions that apply to this action.

Federal regulations include:

- the Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S. C. 7401, especially section 176(c)]; and
- Federal statutes concerning air quality conformity [23 U.S.C. 109(j)];
- US EPA transportation conformity rules (40 CFR, parts 51 and 93)
- USDOT rules that require Metro to update RTPs on a three-year cycle [23 CFR 450.322(a)].

State regulations include:

- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Conformity, (OAR Chapter 340, Division 252);
- Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and Portland Area Ozone Maintenance Plan each prepared in 1996 and which received Federal approvals on September 2, 1997 and May 19, 1997 respectively.

Previous related Metro Council actions include:

- Metro Resolution No. 00-2969, adopting the air quality conformity for the 2000 RTP;
- Metro Resolution No. 02-3186A, amending the 2000 RTP and 2002 MTIP to incorporate OTIA bond projects;
- Metro Ordinance 03-1007A, amending the 2000 RTP to incorporate the two phases of the South Corridor Study

- Metro Resolution 03-3351, amending the 2000 RTP and MTIP to incorporate the South Corridor LRT Project (again, using a less than full analysis method to assess air quality impacts from the project when added to the RTP and MTIP).

3. Anticipated Effects

Approval of this Resolution will allow submittal of the Federal RTP as set forth in Exhibit A and amended by Exhibit "B" and Exhibit "C" to the U.S. Department of Transportation (Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration) as well as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for their review and hopefully, acknowledgement by U.S. DOT and U.S. EPA in a formal conformity determination that the Federal RTP complies with the federal Clean Air Act and federal planning requirements. This approval will allow Metro and local, regional and state agencies to proceed with transportation investments within the region.

4. Budget Impacts

None. The subject transportation investments are allocations of Federal and State transportation funds.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt Resolution 03-3380.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3380A, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS THE FEDERAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN TO MEET FEDERAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: ~~November 6, 2003~~ December 10, 2003
Ellis

Prepared by: Kim

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would adopt the 2004 Federal update to the Regional Transportation Plan ("Federal RTP") as the federal metropolitan transportation plan and would bring the RTP into compliance with the Clean Air Act and federal planning requirements, pending approval of Resolution No. 03-3382 (the 2004 RTP/2004-07 MTIP Air Quality Conformity Determination). Metro is not required to update the regional transportation plan for state planning purposes until 2007.

The 2004 Federal RTP, included as Exhibit "A," ~~includes~~ contains:

- RTP Policies ~~Policy Packet (Part 1)~~ – Chapter 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) presents the overall policy framework for specific transportation policies, objectives and actions identified throughout this plan. It also sets a direction for future planning and decision-making by the Metro Council and the implementing agencies, counties and cities.

The Policy Packet includes ~~The proposed policy amendments for the 2004 Federal RTP, Regional Transportation Plan which includes are limited to changes to several transportation system map changes in Chapter 1 and changes to Chapter 1 policy text to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and funding. No changes to Chapter 1 policy text are proposed as part of this update.~~ The updated system maps include a number of "housekeeping" amendments that reflect fine-tuning of the various modal system maps. Many of these amendments were recommended by local cities and counties as part of local transportation plans adopted since the last RTP update in August 2000. In addition, a new map that identifies the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Planning Boundary is proposed to be added to Chapter 1 of the RTP. This boundary defines the area that the Regional Transportation Plan applies to for federal planning purposes.

- RTP Projects and Systems Analysis ~~Project Packet (Part 2) - Chapters 2 through 5 of the~~ The Project Packet RTP includes an updated Financially Constrained System that will be eligible for state and federal funding and a larger "Illustrative System" that identifies the 20-year transportation needs for the region, detail the scope and nature of proposed improvements that address the 20-year needs and a financial plan for implementing the recommended projects. The chapters have been updated to As the federally recognized system, the financially constrained system is also the source of transportation projects that may be funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. This packet incorporates new projects amendments recommended in local transportation plans or corridor studies adopted since 2000 and endorsed by Metro as "friendly amendments" as part of the local review process, and technical or factual updates to the plan text that reflect updated population, employment and other empirical data needed to establish a new planning horizon year of 2025. Chapter 5 also includes a description of the The updated financially constrained system, which is required for federal certification, planning purposes, and serves as the basis for a conformity determination with the federal Clean Air Act that will be addressed through a separate Resolution No.

03-3382. Projects that have been added to the Federal RTP and that are not included in the 2000 RTP priority system would require compliance with statewide planning goals through a separate amendment to the 2000 RTP Priority System prior to construction.

- RTP Implementation Technical Packet (Part 3) - Chapter 6 of the RTP establishes regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements, and sets requirements for city and county compliance with the RTP. This chapter also establishes criteria for amending the RTP project lists, and the relationship between the RTP and the Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Chapter 6 also identifies future studies needed to refine the RTP as part of future updates. The Technical Packet incorporates technical changes to the Chapter 6 of the RTP that delete technical requirements that have been addressed through recently adopted corridor studies and frame future work that must still be completed as part of future updates to the Federal RTP.

EXISTING LAW

Metro is required to complete a periodic update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in order to maintain continued compliance with the federal Clean Air Act. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved and acknowledged the 2000 RTP air quality conformity determination on January 26, 2001. Under federal regulations, the RTP must be updated every three years to ensure that the plan adequately addresses future travel needs and is consistent with the federal Clean Air Act. As a result, a new plan demonstrating conformity with the Clean Air Act must approved and acknowledged by US DOT and US EPA in a formal conformity determination by January 26, 2004, when the current US DOT/US EPA conformity determination for the 2000 RTP expires. If the conformity determination expires, the plan is considered to "lapse," meaning that federally-funded transportation improvements could not be obligated during the lapse period. This consequence would apply to engineering, right-of-way acquisition or construction of any federally funded or permitted transportation project, except those defined as exempt because they do not have the possibility of increasing vehicle emissions.

Because the 2000 RTP was the result of a major update and was completed relatively recently, the 2004 Federal update to the RTP represents a minor effort that was limited to meeting state and federal requirements, and incorporating new policy direction set by Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council as part of various corridor and special studies adopted since 2000. The update also incorporated a number of "friendly amendments" proposed as part of local transportation plans adopted since 2000.

In addition, federal transportation planning rules require Metro, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization ("MPO"), to identify a MPO Planning Area Boundary. This boundary defines the area that the Regional Transportation Plan applies to for federal planning purposes. The boundary includes the area inside Metro's jurisdictional boundary, the urban growth boundary and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. A new map has been added to chapter 1 of the RTP to meet this requirement.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The most pressing need for this update to the RTP is continued compliance with the federal Clean Air Act. Most of the federal requirements only required minor revisions to the RTP in order to maintain compliance. The more involved efforts involve the requirement for a "financially constrained" plan and demonstration of conformity with the federal Clean Air Act. The conformity finding is based on the projects that make up the "financially constrained" plan. The financial constraint exercise consists of developing a projection of reasonably expected transportation funding over the 20-year plan period, and

selecting a subset of projects from the plan that fit within this “constraint.” The financially constrained system of projects is then evaluated to determine whether implementation of the projects would violate the federal Clean Air Act.

In October 2003, Metro staff worked with members of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and other interested parties to develop a comprehensive inventory of regional transportation projects identified in local plans and special studies adopted since the 2000 RTP was completed in order to update the 2000 RTP project list. This inventory included:

- new projects or studies that are not currently in the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, but that have been adopted in local transportation system plans (TSPs) and regional corridor studies through a public process
- updates to existing 2000 RTP projects or studies to reflect changes in project location, description, cost and recommended timing

Nearly all city and county transportation plans in the Metro region have been updated during the past three years to be consistent with the 2000 RTP. In the process of completing these updates, many local plans identified new transportation projects of regional significance that are proposed as part of the draft 2004 Federal RTP as amendments. Some corridor studies that have been completed (or are nearing completion) since the last RTP update in August 2000 have been endorsed by resolution with the expectation that the new projects generated by these studies would be incorporated into the current RTP update. This includes the Powell/Foster Corridor Study, Phase 1.

Finally, the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, Powell Boulevard Streetscape Study and the McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancement Plan were completed in 2003 with the expectation that new projects generated by these local planning efforts would be incorporated into the 2004 Federal RTP. The recommendations endorsed in each of these efforts are also reflected 2004 Federal RTP.

The updated ~~preferred~~ “Illustrative sSystem” of projects served as the basis for defining an updated financially constrained system of improvements that represents a subset of roughly half of the ~~preferred~~ Illustrative system. Development of the financially constrained system followed the basic principles of (a) maintaining the Region 2040 Plan policy emphasis of the 2000 RTP by focusing improvements in areas that serve as the economic engines for the region, including centers, ports and industrial areas, and (b) maintaining a similar project balance among travel modes, including roads, transit, bikeways, pedestrian improvements and other project categories.

The 2004 Federal RTP ~~Regional Transportation Plan~~ provides an updated set of financially constrained projects and programs for future MTIP allocations and is anticipated to meet the federal clean air act. As the federally recognized system, the financially constrained system is also the source of transportation projects that may be funded through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The MTIP allocates federal funds in the region, and is updated every two years, and includes a rolling, four-year program of transportation improvements.

Technical Considerations

Because of the inherent time and resource constraints, a single round of modeling and analysis was utilized for this update. The principal purpose for this approach was to complete the federal air quality conformity analysis required to demonstrate that the updated plan is consistent with the region’s air quality maintenance plan.

To achieve this, the 2004 Federal RTP update combined the preferred and priority systems contained in the 2000 RTP as a single preferred ~~“Illustrative”~~ system that established the universe of projects eligible for inclusion in the financially constrained system that is eligible for federal funding. Exceptions to this guideline were local and regional projects identified in corridor refinements and local transportation plans since the 2000 RTP was adopted. This approach focused TPAC’s activities on defining the financially constrained system, and was based on the assumption that the combination of preferred ~~“Illustrative”~~ system projects from the existing plan, and new projects from subsequent studies, will be adequate to meet travel demand in the new 2025 horizon year.

~~As part of documenting findings from this limited RTP modeling exercise, staff reviewed and updated system performance conclusions from the 2000 RTP, as appropriate, to reflect the new preferred and financially constrained systems. The 2004 Federal RTP Update did not include an iterative process of multiple rounds of modeling to test new projects against the congestion management system and other RTP performance measures, since the new preferred system of improvements is expected to perform adequately. Any outstanding issues that were identified are referenced for future corridor or area studies.~~

In addition to updating transportation projects and growth forecasts, Metro must demonstrate that the 2004 Federal RTP meets federal and state air quality analysis requirements. During November and December, Metro completed a technical analysis known as air quality conformity.

The results of the 2004 Federal RTP update work tasks are included in the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Public Comment document, which is included as Exhibit "A:" (Parts 1, 2 and 3). A ~~30-day~~ public comment period was held from October 31, 2003 through December 4~~10~~, 2003. ~~The Metro Council held a public hearing on Dec. 4, 2003. Exhibit “B” includes a “Summary of Public Comments: Receive October 31, 2003 through December 4, 2003,” dated December 5, 2003. Exhibit “C” includes a “Supplemental Public Comments: Received December 5, 2003 through December 10, 2003,” dated December 11, 2003.~~

The Metro Council is being asked to approve Exhibit A as amended by Exhibit “B” and “C” ~~this work and direct that a request be~~ this resolution, the updated Federal RTP and Resolution 03-3382 upon its adoption by the Metro Council be submitted for to the U.S. Department of Transportation and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency prior to January 26, 2004 for review and for acknowledgement that these documents conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, of the 2004 RTP Conformity Determination.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

None known. The region is and has been in compliance with the Clean Air Act since 1996. The 2004 Federal RTP financially constrained system of transportation improvements is anticipated to meet federal clean air act requirements.

2. Legal Antecedents

There are a wide variety of past Federal, State and regional legal actions that apply to this action.

Federal regulations include:

- the Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S. C. 7401, especially section 176(c)]; and
- Federal statutes concerning air quality conformity [23 U.S.C. 109(j)];
- US EPA transportation conformity rules (40 CFR, parts 51 and 93)
- USDOT rules that require Metro to update RTPs on a three-year cycle [23 CFR 450.322(a)].

State regulations include:

- Oregon Administrative Rules for Transportation Conformity, (OAR Chapter 340, Division 252);
- Portland Area Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan and Portland Area Ozone Maintenance Plan each prepared in 1996 and which received Federal approvals on September 2, 1997 and May 19, 1997 respectively.

Previous related Metro Council actions include:

- Metro Resolution No. 00-2969, adopting the air quality conformity for the 2000 RTP;
- Metro Resolution No. 02-3186A, amending the 2000 RTP and 2002 MTIP to incorporate OTIA bond projects;
- Metro Ordinance 03-1007A, amending the 2000 RTP to incorporate the two phases of the South Corridor Study
- Metro Resolution 03-3351, amending the 2000 RTP and MTIP to incorporate the South Corridor LRT Project (again, using a less than full analysis method to assess air quality impacts from the project when added to the RTP and MTIP).

3. Anticipated Effects

Approval of this Resolution will allow submittal of the 2004 Federal RTP as set forth in Exhibit A and amended by Exhibit "B" and Exhibit "C" to the U.S. Department of Transportation, (Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration) as well as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for their review and hopefully, acknowledgement by U.S. DOT and U.S. EPA in a formal conformity determination that the 2004 Federal RTP complies with the federal Clean Air Act and federal planning requirements. This approval will allow Metro and local, regional and state agencies to proceed with transportation investments within the region.

4. Budget Impacts

None. The subject transportation investments are allocations of Federal and State transportation funds.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt Resolution 03-3380.



**2004 Regional
Transportation Plan**

**Summary
of Public
Comments**

**Received Oct. 31, 2003
through Dec. 4, 2003**

**TPAC Recommendation to JPACT
December 5, 2003**



METRO

PEOPLE PLACES
OPEN SPACES



METRO

2004 RTP UPDATE

Summary of Recommendations on Public Comments Received

October 31 – December 4, 2003

Discussion Items

Comment 1: Proceed with adoption of the federal RTP, however, do not adopt a revised RTP that attempts to meet the Transportation Planning Rule and other state planning requirements. Direct Metro TPAC to establish a work program for undertaking a comprehensive update of the RTP. (Washington County, 11/21/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend adopting a federal RTP only and withdrawing Ordinance 03-1024 at this time. The federal RTP would include an updated set of financially constrained projects and a larger set "illustrative projects" for federal planning purposes. The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved and acknowledged the 2000 RTP air quality conformity determination on January 26, 2001. Under federal regulations, the RTP must be updated every three years to ensure that the plan adequately addresses future travel needs and is consistent with the federal Clean Air Act. As a result, a new plan demonstrating conformity with the Clean Air Act must be approved and acknowledged by US DOT and US EPA in a formal conformity determination by January 26, 2004, when the 2000 RTP conformity determination expires.

Metro is not required to update the regional transportation plan for state planning purposes until 2007. The next RTP update will begin in 2005, and is proposed to be a more expansive effort that involves broader public discussion of plan policies and projects. The next update will address state and federal planning requirements.

Projects that have been added to the 2004 RTP and that are not included in the 2000 RTP priority system would require compliance with statewide planning goals through a separate amendment to the 2000 RTP priority system prior to construction. The goal would be to complete this amendment process within the next 3 months.

Comment 2: Add the Vancouver Rail Bridge Project to the Financially Constrained System as a priority of the Regional Transportation Plan. The project is to replace the existing "swing span" with a "lift span" and place it closer to the middle of the river. Estimated cost is \$42 million. (Ad-Hoc Steering Committee for the Vancouver Rail Bridge Upgrade Project, 11/26/03)

TPAC Recommendation: The project is not currently eligible for federal funds under the Truman-Hobbs Act. Funding for the project would not come from sources used to forecast the financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan and alternate sources such as Truman Hobbs, lottery or railroad funds cannot be assumed as "reasonably available." Therefore, amend the project into Preferred System only.

Metro Resolution No. 03-3271 identifies this project as a priority project in the region, if eligible to receive Truman Hobbs funding. Truman Hobbs is a federal program that funds projects to address rail hazards to navigation. TPAC recommends that future regional position papers seek amendment to the Truman Hobbs Act to allow analysis of the navigational hazards to account for truck and auto commerce vehicle delay on the I-5 bridge due to the lift span operations caused by the railroad bridge. The rail bridge swing-span is lined up with the lift span on the I-5 bridges making it difficult and hazardous for ships to use the I-5 "high" fixed span section. Using the fixed span section avoids the need for opening the bridge and the resulting delay on I-5.

In addition, the I-5 Trade Corridor Study Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) study will evaluate replacement of the I-5 bridge with drawbridge and "high" fixed span alternatives. If the I-5 EIS process recommends a drawbridge replacement, then the I-5 bridge replacement project should be responsible for replacing the rail bridge swing span. If the I-5 EIS process recommends a "high" fixed span replacement, then replacement of the railroad swing span becomes less of an issue. Although the timing of a "high" fixed span replacement could be an issue and may result in the need to construct an interim improvement for which funding is not identified.

Comment 3: How does Metro plan to respond to an increase in expected long-term state revenues due to passage of OTIA 3? (TPAC, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Recommend that a post-adoption process be used to identify approximately \$300 million in additional projects to be candidates for inclusion in the financially constrained system, should the revenue forecast increase beyond what is assumed in the 2004 RTP. These projects would be selected using the same methodology as that used to develop the 2004 financially constrained system.

Comment 4: Recommend amending the RTP as defined in Attachment 1 to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding. This amendments provides clear, immediate prioritization of RSIA's for transportation planning and funding decisions, but is also based on proposed Title 4 amendments that are still in development. This amendment will help support efforts to focus future transportation investments to those parts of the region that are most critical to the region's economy and successful implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. (MTAC, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested. This comment has also been forward to MPAC for consideration at the December 10 meeting. Attachment 2 identifies a second option discussed by TPAC.

Comment 5: It is premature to remove the regional freight system designation entirely on McLoughlin Boulevard (99E) between Highway 224 and I-205 south ramps in Oregon City. There are industrial properties throughout the Corridor with the largest being an area near Roethe Road of about 80 acres. The area adjacent to McLoughlin Boulevard is a major destination for freight. It serves everything from industrial to retail including a major auto sales area. McLoughlin Boulevard would be an alternative for traffic including freight when Highway-224 and I-205 is closed or congested due to incidents on this route. The County recommends leaving the designation as is and plan on reviewing the classification as part of the major RTP update that is expected to start within the next year. If a change is necessary, the County recommends that McLoughlin Blvd be down graded to a Road connector. (Clackamas County, 12/3/04)

TPAC Recommendation: Recommend downgrading this segment of McLoughlin Boulevard from a Main Roadway Route to a Road Connector to recognize that this route serves a less important function than a Main Roadway Route. Main roadway routes are intended to connect major activity centers in the region to other areas in Oregon or other states. Road connectors are intended to connect freight facilities or freight generation areas to the Main Roadway Routes. The regional freight system map will be more thoroughly updated in the next RTP update, in order to evaluate potential freight designations from a regional system point of view.

Consent Items

PACKET 1 – POLICY UPDATE

Comment 6: Add the Washington Square Regional Center Greenbelt Trail to the Regional Bicycle System Map. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested. In addition, TPAC recommends adding this multi-use trail to the Regional Pedestrian System.

Comment 7: Beef Bend, Gaarde and Walnut from Gaarde to Scholls are arterials in the TSP but listed as collectors in the RTP. When Tigard adopted the TSP, it was acknowledged that these discrepancies exist. The RTP should be updated to reflect these classifications. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. These changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft policy update packet.

Comment 8: The street design section has N Ivanhoe (Richmond to Philadelphia) updated to Community Street. This item should be removed from the list of proposed policy amendments because the existing classification is Community Street. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 9: McLoughlin Boulevard - Urban Road termini should change from SE 17th – City limits to Woodward – 17th. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 10: N Richmond (Lombard to Ivanhoe) should remain a Community Street. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 11: NE Sandy's termini for the Regional Street classification should change from 12th – 47th to 54th – 57th. The street design classification should change from Regional Boulevard to Regional Street. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 12: NE Sandy's Regional Boulevard classification termini should change from 47th – 82nd to 57th – 82nd. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 13: Sandy Boulevard (98th – 122nd) is classified as a Regional Boulevard in the 2000 RTP not a Community Boulevard (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 14: SE 17th termini for Community Boulevard should change from Tacoma - Andover to Tacoma - Linn. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 15: NE/SE 39th termini for the Regional Street classification should change from Broadway - Powell to Broadway - Holgate. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 16: SE 39th termini for Community Street should change from Powell - Woodstock to Holgate - Woodstock. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 17: Add N Greeley Avenue between N Interstate Avenue and N Going Street as a Road Connector on the Regional Freight System map. Portland's TSP identifies Greeley as a Major Truck Street located in a Freight District. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 18: Delete the Gateway Regional Center from section 6.7.7 Areas of Special Concern. Portland's TSP has addressed this area in accordance with the Transportation Planning Rule. Delete or revise Figure 1.13b Gateway Regional Center - Special Area of Concern to reflect its current status. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 19: Update the Regional Motor Vehicle Classification, Regional Street Design and Regional Freight System Maps to reflect classifications recently adopted in the Wilsonville transportation system plan, as follows:

| <u>Street Design Classification Map (Figure 1.4)</u> | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| <u>Street Name</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Current RTP Classification</u> | <u>Proposed RTP Classification</u> | <u>Source of Change</u> |
| 95th Avenue | Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road | Not Classified | Collector of Regional Significance | Wilsonville TSP |
| Kinsman Road | Boeckman Road to Barber Street | No Road | Planned Collector of Regional Significance | Wilsonville TSP |
| Kinsman Road | Barber Street to Wilsonville Road | Not Classified | Collector of Regional Significance | Wilsonville TSP |
| Boeckman Road | Railroad Tracks to 110th Avenue | No Road | Planned Minor Arterial | Wilsonville TSP |
| Boeckman Road (old Tooze Road) | 110th Avenue to Grahams Ferry Road | Not Classified | Minor Arterial | Wilsonville TSP |

| <u>Street Design Classification Map (Figure 1.4)</u> | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>Street Name</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Current RTP Classification</u> | <u>Proposed RTP Classification</u> | <u>Source of Change</u> |
| 95th Avenue | Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road | Not Classified | Urban Road | Wilsonville TSP |
| Kinsman Road | Boeckman Road to Barber Street | No Road | Planned Urban Road | Wilsonville TSP |
| Kinsman Road | Barber Street to Wilsonville Road | Not Classified | Urban Road | Wilsonville TSP |
| Boeckman Road | Railroad Tracks to 110th Avenue | No Road | Planned Community Street | Wilsonville TSP |
| Boeckman Road (old Tooze Road) | 110th Avenue to Grahams Ferry Road | Not Classified | Community Street | Wilsonville TSP |

| <u>Regional Freight System Map (Figure 1.17)</u> | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>Street Name</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Current RTP Classification</u> | <u>Proposed RTP Classification</u> | <u>Source of Change</u> |
| Boones Ferry Road | Day Street to 95th Avenue | Not Classified | Road Connector | Wilsonville TSP |
| Elligsen Road | Boones Ferry Road to Parkway Avenue | Not Classified | Road Connector | Wilsonville TSP |
| 95th Avenue | Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road | Not Classified | Road Connector | Wilsonville TSP |
| Kinsman Road | Boeckman Road to Barber Street | No Road | Planned Road Connector | Wilsonville TSP |
| Boeckman Road | 95th Avenue to Proposed Kinsman Road | Not Classified | Road Connector | Wilsonville TSP |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| <u>Kinsman Road</u> | <u>Barber Street to Wilsonville Road</u> | <u>Not Classified</u> | <u>Road Connector</u> | <u>Wilsonville TSP</u> |
| <u>Parkway Avenue</u> | <u>Boeckman Road to Town Center Loop W</u> | <u>Not Classified</u> | <u>Road Connector</u> | <u>Wilsonville TSP</u> |
| <u>Town Center Loop W</u> | <u>Parkway Avenue to Wilsonville Road</u> | <u>Not Classified</u> | <u>Road Connector</u> | <u>Wilsonville TSP</u> |
| <u>Wilsonville Road</u> | <u>Town Center Loop W to Kinsman Road</u> | <u>Not Classified</u> | <u>Road Connector</u> | <u>Wilsonville TSP</u> |

(City of Wilsonville, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 20: Add a Main Roadway designation to the newly completed Highway 47 Bypass in Forest Grove to identify the route's function as a replacement to Tualatin Valley Highway from the Highway 47 bypass to the western Forest Grove city limits. (ODOT, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 21: We are concerned that the current RTP update, in the crunch to meet a constrained timeline, will move the region away from the principles and modal goals set out in the 2000 RTP. Recognizing that the region must move forward with this RTP update in order to meet federal deadlines, CLF and the BTA urge the Council to note that the project mix in this update does not reflect a well-thought-out, well-coordinated strategy to achieve a truly multi-modal transportation system.

Looking forward to the next major RTP update, we urge Metro to start the process in 2004 and set a clear goal of achieving a mode split that looks more like that contained in the 2000 RTP, a document developed with extensive and meaningful public involvement. With virtually no public process and little technical evaluation, the current RTP update with its substantially shifted mode split should be considered an interim document. It should not be the basis of future plans. In addition, CLF and the BTA request a "seat at the table" in both technical and policy arenas to help ensure that the next major RTP update process supports the Region 2040 vision. (Bicycle Transportation Alliance and Coalition for a Livable Future and Lenny Anderson, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. There are no changes proposed for the mode share target policies in the RTP, though there is a shift toward road capacity projects in the overall breakout of the draft financially constrained system as indicated in the comment. The financially constrained system is also larger, in both total dollars and as a share of the "preferred" system. These changes reflect the OTIA effect on the revenue forecast which has focused primarily on modernization revenues for roads, but also the fact that some big transit capital projects have been completed since the 2000 RTP was adopted (including Central City Streetcar, Airport MAX and Interstate MAX). In addition, light rail to Vancouver was removed from the financially constrained system because of a lack of consensus in Clark County, Wa. to construct this improvement in the 20-year plan period. To this extent, the 2000 RTP had an unusually large amount of transit capital in the constrained system. There are also new local revenues in the forecast, with this revenue more typically directed at road capacity projects. The percentage of bike, pedestrian and boulevard projects also shifted slightly, increasing from 10 percent of the cost of projects in the 2000 RTP to representing 13 percent in the proposed 2004 RTP.

With regard to the request to have a "seat at the table," TPAC and JPACT membership is defined in by-laws. TPAC includes citizen membership opportunities. A decision has not been made whether to have a separate advisory committee for the next RTP update. However, if an advisory committee is formed, the Coalition for a Livable Future will be invited to participate.

Comment 22: Change the current "Road connector" classification on N Philadelphia from N. Lombard to N. Ivanhoe to "No Designation" on the Regional Freight System Map. (ODOT, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

PACKET 2 – PROJECT UPDATE

Comment 23: Add the Washington Square Regional Center Greenbelt Trail to the RTP preferred and financially constrained systems for \$2 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. This change is reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list as Project #6057.

Comment 24: Add the Walnut Street extension project to the RTP preferred and financially constrained systems for \$19 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. This change is reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list as Project #6038.

Comment 25: Add Project # 6011 (Highway 217 South Mall overcrossing) to the financially constrained system and identify jurisdiction as Tigard and ODOT. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. These changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 26: Delete RTP project #6033 (Walnut Street Improvements, Phase I) and RTP project # 6046 (Walnut Street Improvements, Phase II) from the project list because they have been completed. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. These changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 27: RTP project # 6011 is listed on the RTP project list, however it is not identified on the RTP map or in the text of the RTP. Also, this project should be a Tigard jurisdiction as well as ODOT. This is the South Mall to Nimbus Connection identified in the Regional Center Plan. The Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$26 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend adding to RTP map. Project description changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 28: RTP project # 6032 is listed on the RTP project list, however it is not identified on the RTP map or in the text of the RTP. The project description in Tigard's TSP

states: "Realign Hunziker Road to meet Hampton at 72nd Avenue – requires overcrossing over ORE 217 - removes existing 72nd/Hunziker intersection." The TSP estimates the cost for this improvement at \$10 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend adding to RTP map. Project description changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 29: RTP project #6052 should have both Tigard and Beaverton under the jurisdiction as it enters both Cities. The project location is Nimbus Drive to Northern Mall area. The Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$30 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend adding to RTP map. Project description changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 30: RTP project #6053 – the Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$38 million. (City of Tigard, 10/31/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend adding to RTP map. Project description changes are reflected in the October 31, 2003 public comment draft project list.

Comment 31: Project #1024 (I-5/McLoughlin Ramps) was not included in ODOT's financially constrained system and should be moved to the Expanded financially constrained system. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This project was included as part of City of Portland's Financially Constrained System revenue cap.

Comment 32: Move Project #1030 (Ross Island Bridgehead) to the Expanded financially constrained system. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This project was included as part of City of Portland's Financially Constrained System revenue cap.

Comment 33: Move Project #3129 (Glencoe Interchange) to the Expanded financially constrained system, if appropriate to be included in RTP at all, for air quality conformity. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This project was removed from the RTP project list altogether because it is located outside Metro's Planning Area Boundary. It will be modeled for air quality conformity.

Comment 34: Move Project# 5135 (McLoughlin Boulevard improvements from I-205 to 10th Avenue) to the Expanded financially constrained system. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This project was included as part of Clackamas County's Financially Constrained System revenue cap and received funding from the MTIP.

Comment 35: Add I-5/99W Connector Ph. 1 Arterial Connection to financially constrained system. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This project was included in the financially constrained system as Project #6141.

Comment 36: Add new Highway 217 project to construct braided southbound on-ramp from Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and southbound off-ramp to Allen Boulevard. Add this project to the Expanded financially constrained system. (ODOT, 11/6/03)

TPAC Recommendation: This project is part of RTP Project #3023 which is in the preferred system only. Recommend including the project on an expanded financially constrained system that will be developed as a post-adoption activity.

Comment 37: Update the project names for the streetcar projects as follows:

- #1015 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3a (River Place)
- #1086 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3b (Gibbs)
- #1087 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3c (Bancroft)
- #1106 - Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 1 (Lloyd District)
- #1107 - Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 2 (CEID)

(City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 38: Project #1199 - Barbur Boulevard Pedestrian Access to Transit Improvements should be moved to the Preferred System. The I-5/Barbur Corridor Study will precede improvements in this corridor. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 39: Project #2016 - NE Halsey Bikeway should be moved to the Preferred System. Due to right-of-way constraints, the project needs additional study to determine feasibility. The Tillamook Bike Boulevard provides an alternative route through this section of northeast Portland. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 40: Project #4015 - US-30 Bypass Improvements Study should be combined with #4037. Delete #4015. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 41: Project #4030 - NE 11-13th Avenue Connector should be combined with #4037. Delete Project #4030. (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 42: Project #4037 - Columbia and Lombard Intersection Improvements should be updated as follows:

- Name: Lombard - Columbia Connection near MLK Jr. Boulevard
- Description: Improve road connection between Columbia Boulevard and Lombard in the vicinity of MLK Jr. Boulevard to 11th/13th, to facilitate freight movement.
- Estimated Cost: \$16, 835,000

- Jurisdiction: Portland/Port
 - RTP Program Years: 2004 – 2009
- (City of Portland, 11/12/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 43: Add back project #1106 to conduct a feasibility study of streetcar service in inner eastside Portland neighborhoods. (City of Portland, 11/17/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested. This project was inadvertently replaced by a new project to construct phase 1 of the eastside streetcar between the Pearl district and the Lloyd district.

Comment 44: Project # 3099 (1st Avenue/Glencoe Road widening): Change program years from 2010-15 to 2004-09. (City of Hillsboro, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 45: Project #3118 (TV Highway/Brookwood Avenue intersection alignment): Change program years from 2010-15 to 2004-09. (City of Hillsboro, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 46: Project #3117 (Grant Street East-West connector/extension to Brookwood Pkwy): Change program years from 2010-15 to 2004-09. (City of Hillsboro, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 47: Project # 3139 (US 26 over crossing at 229th Avenue): Change program years from 2010-15 to 2004-09. (City of Hillsboro, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 48: Project #1185 – Change program years to 2004-09 to reflect scheduled project completion under MSTIP3 in 2004/05. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 49: Project #3011 – Change project description to read Cornell to 185th to be consistent with #3009. (ODOT, 11/6/03 and Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 50: Project #3036 – Change cost estimate to \$12.7 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 51: Project #3066 and #3067 - Change 2040 link from Beaverton Corridor to Bethany TC. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 52: Project #3069 – Change location to Allen to Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy. and cost estimate to \$13.3 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 53: Project #3099 – Change jurisdiction to Washington County because road is planned to remain part of Countywide Road System (i.e., is and will be under County's roadway jurisdiction) and change cost estimate to \$14.8 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 54: Project #3103 – Change project location to 185th to Brookwood and cost estimate to \$34.8 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 55: Project #3115 – Change jurisdiction to Wash. Co. to reflect current roadway jurisdictional responsibility. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 56: Project #3133 – Change project description to read "Construct eastbound on-ramp, westbound off-ramp and southbound auxiliary lane" to reflect anticipated improvements already funded under OTIA. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 57: Project #3137 – Change cost estimate to \$12.5 million to reflect County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 58: Project #3142 – Change project location to read "170th to Cornelius Pass" with an estimated cost of \$21 million and program year of 2010-15. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 59: Project #3149 – Change project description to read "Relocate westbound on-ramp to construct westbound to southbound loop ramp and widen overcrossing to accommodate additional southbound through-lane". (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 60: Project #3174 – Change project location to “Leahy to 84th Ave.” and project description to “widen to 5 lanes...” to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 61: Project #3176 – Change project name to 95th Avenue Extension. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 62: Project #3180 – Change project description to read “Construct new collector with sidewalks and bike lanes.” (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 63: Project #3186 – Change project location to read “US 26 to Cornell Road” to be consistent with new proposed MSTIP project. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 64: Project #3188 – Change project location to read “Cornell Road to Laidlaw Road” to be consistent with new proposed MSTIP project. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 65: Project #3199 – For consistency with County Transportation Plan, change project location to read “143rd Avenue to future Springville Extension” and change cost estimate to \$21.3 million. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 66: Project #3202 – For consistency with County Transportation Plan, change project location to read “Future Springville Extension to Cornelius Pass” and include cost estimate of \$12.4 million. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 67: Project #3209 – Change 2040 link from Tanasbourne TC to Bethany TC. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 68: Project #3214 – Delete phrase “complete boulevard design improvements” from project description because project is not designated for boulevard design considerations in County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 69: Project #3215 – Change cost estimate to \$15.4 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 70: Project #6030 – Change cost estimate to \$41.6 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 71: Project #6043 – Change cost estimate to \$8.2 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 72: Add new project to Preferred System to widen 209th from Kinnaman to Farmington Road for \$21 million in the 2010-2015 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 73: Add new project to Preferred System to widen 174th from Bronson Road to Meadowgrass Road to 3 lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks for \$13.9 million in the 2016-25 time period. This project is the continuation of RTP project #3205 the 173rd/174th undercrossing of Hwy. 26. This route is also designated as an arterial road in both the 2000 RTP and the County's Transportation Plan. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 74: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Springville Road from 185th to Portland Community College access to 5 lanes for \$3.8 million in the 2010-15 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 75: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Springville Road from PCC access to Kaiser Road to 3 lanes @ \$9.6 million in the 2016-25 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 76: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Laidlaw Road from West Union Road to Kaiser Road to 3 lanes @ \$11 million in the 2010-15 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 77: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Kaiser Road from Bethany Boulevard to Cornell Road to 3 lanes @ \$18.6 million in the 2010-15 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 78: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Kaiser Road from Springville to Bethany Boulevard to 5 lanes @ \$4.6 million in the 2016-25 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 79: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Jenkins Road from Murray Boulevard to 158th Avenue to five lanes @ \$7.3 million in the 2010-15 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 80: Add new project to Preferred System to widen 197th/198th from Tualatin Valley Highway to Baseline Road to 3 lanes @\$13.9 million in the 2016-25 time period. This is identified as a collector of regional significance in the 2000 RTP and is included in the County's Transportation Plan project list. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 81: Add new project to Preferred System "Cornelius Pass Interchange Improvement @ Hwy. 26 to add northbound to westbound loop ramp". Estimated cost is \$30 million and program year is 2016-25. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 82: Add new project to Preferred System to widen Barnes Road from Leahy to County Line to 3 lanes for \$7.5 million in 2016-25 time period. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 83: Project #3024 – Delete project on US 26 from Cornell Road to 185th Avenue, which duplicates revised #3011. (ODOT, 11/6/03 and Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 84: Project #3043 – Delete seven-lane project on Walker Road from Cedar Hills to Murray because need shown in Washington County Transportation Plan is only five lanes. (Washington County, 11/20/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 85: Remove project #6091, the Boeckman Road I-5 Overcrossing, from the financially constrained list and move it to the preferred system. (City of Wilsonville, 11/21/03 and 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 86: Add project #6093, the Barber Street extension, to the financially constrained list. The Barber Street Extension project was determined to be a higher priority

project because of its ability to have a greater impact on providing relief to the Wilsonville Road Interchange. (City of Wilsonville, 11/21/03 and 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 87: Add the Tillamook Branch Trestle project to the RTP. The project provides an important east-west multi-use trail connection across the Willamette River between Lake Oswego and Milwaukie. (Clackamas County Board of Commissioners, 11/21/03, and City of Lake Oswego, 11/24/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. This bridge currently serves freight rail and has been identified as a possible future commuter rail connection. Amend project into the Preferred and Financially Constrained systems as a feasibility study to evaluate a bicycle and pedestrian component.

Comment 88: Revise description of Project #3013 to include construction of multi-use trail. (Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District, 11/24/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 89: Revise description of Project #3015 to include construction of multi-use trail. (Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District, 11/24/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 90: Add back a project to widen I-205 SB on-ramp at Airport Way for \$10 million (preferred system) in 2016-2025 time period. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested. This project (#2070 in the 2000 RTP) was inadvertently replaced by the new project #2070, which is also needed in the 2004-09 time period.

Comment 91: Delete project #4019. There is no plan for another LRT station in PIC or for realigning track there. New Project #4060 is the correct LRT realignment project - to occur with future PDX terminal expansion east. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 92: Move Project #4029 to 2004-09 time period. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 93: Revise 2040 location of Project #4030. This project is located in the Columbia Corridor, not PDX IA. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 94: Update Project #4038 cost to \$790,000. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 95: Move Project #4045 to 2004-09 time period. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 96: Move Project #4060 to 2010-15 time period. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 97: Update Project #4085 cost to \$350,000. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 98: Move Project #4086 to 2004-09 time period. (Port of Portland, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 99: Add Project #1022 Sullivan's Gulch / Banfield Trail Feasibility Study (Regional Trail #37) to the financially constrained system at a cost of \$150,000. This trail which would be on the north side of the freeway would connect the Eastbank Esplanade Trail to the I-205 Bike and Pedestrian Trail. The trail would connect the Central City, Lloyd District Regional Center, Hollywood Town Center and Gateway Regional Center. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 100: Add preliminary engineering and design portion of Project #5052 17th Avenue Trolley Trail Connector (Regional Trail #30) to the financially constrained system at a cost of \$200,000. The project will connect the Springwater Corridor and Three Bridges project to the Milwaukie Town Center and Trolley Trail. The proposed project is within one-mile of downtown Milwaukie. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 101: Add the feasibility study portion of Project #5207 Mt. Scott Creek Trail (Regional Trail #48) to the financially constrained system at a cost of \$767,000. This project includes a feasibility study and the cost of trail design and construction, including an under-crossing for the trail at S.E. Sunnyside Road. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, 11/25/03 and City of Happy Valley, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Add the feasibility study to the financially constrained system and consider adding the remaining portion of the project to the financially constrained system in future RTP updates to reflect feasibility study recommendations.

Comment 102: Add the feasibility study portion of Project #5095 Phillips Creek Trail (Regional Trail #32) to the financially constrained system at a cost of \$100,000. This trail includes a trail loop around Clackamas Regional Center, connecting to I-205 Bike / Pedestrian Trail and the North Clackamas Greenway Trail, following Phillips Creek. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, 11/25/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 103: Add the feasibility study portion of Project #4076 Columbia Slough Trail (Regional Trail #45) to the financially constrained system at a cost of \$150,000. This trail would connect Kelley Point Park east to Blue Lake Regional Park. Implementation costs to be estimated following the completion of the study. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, 11/25/03 and Columbia Slough Watershed, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 104: Add a new study to evaluate a new west side arterial bridge over the Columbia River between the Ports of Vancouver and Portland to serve freight movement. The current I-5 Partnership recommendation to widen the existing I-5 bridge is not adequate to address traffic congestion in the I-5 corridor. (North Portland Neighborhood Association, 11/3/03 and Hayden Island Neighborhood Network, 11/26/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This option was already examined in the I-5 Trade Corridor Study and deferred to be addressed as part of the I-5 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Study (Project # 4009). The I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan directs the EIS study to evaluate whether or not a six-lane freeway plus two 2-lane arterials (one in the vicinity of the I-5 corridor and one in the vicinity of the railroad bridge) is a viable alternative for consideration in the EIS.

Comment 105: Reduce Project #2047 (Division Boulevard) project limits to be Kelly Street to Burnside Street and cost estimate to be \$3.5 million as requested in the East Multnomah County submittal of October 20. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 106: Reduce Project #2027 (Civic Neighborhood LRT Station/Plaza) cost estimate to be \$3.5 million. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 107: Update Project #2014 (Glisan Street Bikeway) project limits to be 162nd Avenue to 202nd Avenue and reduce cost estimate to be \$200,000. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 108: Reduce Project #2057 (Gresham RC Pedestrian Improvements) cost estimate to \$5 million. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 109: Add a new project to construct a MAX Path from Ruby Junction to Cleveland Station for \$2 million in the Preferred and Financially Constrained Systems. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 110: Add Project #2048 (Burnside Boulevard - Wallula to Hogan) to the Financially Constrained System. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 111: Update Project #2028 (Powell Boulevard) cost estimate to reflect \$7 million of local funds and \$5.25 million of OTIA funds. (ODOT, 11/6/03 and City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 112: Delete Project #2049 (Powell Boulevard) as this project is included in Project #2028. (City of Gresham, 12/1/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 113: Add a new project to the Financially Constrained System called Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe Multimodal Improvements from St Louis to Philadelphia. The project will implement signal and pedestrian crossing improvements to improve pedestrian safety and freight flow. The estimated cost is \$1.1 million and time period is 2004-09. This project implements a portion of the St Johns pedestrian district improvements (#1150). This phase was selected for MTIP funding and should be identified as a stand-alone project in the RTP. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 114: Add Project # 1095 (Union Station Multi-modal Center Study) to Financially Constrained System and update cost estimate to \$300,000. This project is a priority for the City of Portland; it was submitted in the most recent MTIP process and likely to be resubmitted for MTIP funding in the future. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 115: Add Project #1173 (Hillsdale TC Pedestrian Improvements) to the financially constrained system in the 2010-15 time period. This project constructs pedestrian and street network improvements for a Town Center warrant inclusion in the Financially Constrained System. This project is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 116: Add Project #1096 (Barbur/I-5 Corridor Study) to the financially constrained system in the 2004-09 time period. This study is part of the Metro Corridor Initiatives Planning Program and its completion and recommendations will provide improved project definitions for several RTP projects in the vicinity of the Barbur Boulevard/I-5 Corridor. This project is identified in the Refinement Plans and Studies Chapter of the Portland TSP and the Regional Transportation Plan. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 117: Add a new project for the Capitol Hwy/Vermont/30th Ave. Intersection to the preferred and financially constrained systems for \$450,000 in the

2010-15 time period. This project will provide traffic safety and pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements at this intersection and approaching street segments. This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. It was not built as part of the initial street project improvements due to budget limitations. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 118: Add a new project for Capitol Highway between Sunset and Barbur to the preferred system for \$910,000 in the 2010-2015 time period. This project will provide pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements. This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. Portions of this project segment are rated as higher priority improvements. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe. (City of Portland, 12/3/03 and Glenn Bridger, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 119: Add a new project called SW Capitol Highway – Marquam Segment between Huber and Stephenson to the Preferred System. The project will provide improved pedestrian crossings and median design treatments. Estimated Cost: \$750,000 and Program Year: 2016-2026. This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe. (City of Portland, 12/3/03 and Glenn Bridger, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 120: Delete Project #2024 (Gateway RC Pedestrian District Improvements – Phase III) from the financially constrained system, but retain in Preferred System. Retain all other current project information. This is the last of a three phase implementation schedule of local street network development in the regional center. The first and second phase of this project should remain as is in the Financially Constrained System. (City of Portland, 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 121: The recently identified safety improvements (guardrails) to Boones Ferry Road and Arnold Street in southwest Portland should be added to the Portland TSP and Regional Transportation Plan. (Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This comment will be forwarded to the City of Portland for consideration.

Comment 122: Move Project # 1176 and #1177 to the 2004-09 time period. (Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., 12/3/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 123: The description for Project # 1181 (Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway ITS) should be clarified to identify that it includes portions of Capitol Highway. The project should

also be expanded to include upgrading the street to fill in missing sidewalks and constructing street crossing improvements. Project #1184 is also very important. (Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., 12/3/03 and Glenn Bridger, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. Project #1181 is to implement system management strategies to help traffic flow more efficiently in this corridor with signal timing and other measures. A separate project, Project #1176, has been identified for this corridor to address bicycle, pedestrian and access to transit needs, and is included in the financially constrained system. Phase 1 of Project #1184 has been included in the financially constrained system, which involves realigning Oleson Road to provide a direct connection to Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and Scholls Ferry Road.

Comment 124: Add Project #1004, #1031, #1195 and #1196 to the financially constrained system. These are critical projects for moving traffic through southwest Portland in the Barbur/I-5 south Corridor. (Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., 12/3/03 and Don Baack, Hillsdale Neighborhood Association, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. The four projects represent approximately \$134 million. While these projects are important improvements to serve this part of the region, the revenue forecast is not adequate to include these projects in the financially constrained system at this time.

Comment 125: Add a new project to reconstruct the Barbur Boulevard structures over Vermont Street and Newberry Street near Capital Highway/Barbur Boulevard Intersection. These structures had emergency repairs five years ago that were expected to last 10 years. (Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., 12/3/03 and Don Baack, Hillsdale Neighborhood Association, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. This comment will be forwarded to the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Comment 126: Place the entire Wilsonville Road Interchange project within the Financially Constrained list, not just the PE and ROW with construction on the Preferred List. This is important because this project has been identified as a high priority project both by the City and by ODOT, as well as regional and federal partners who participated in ODOT's 2002 Freeway Access Study. The critical nature of this project is evidenced by the City of Wilsonville's commitment of \$3.5 million in the city's current budget to begin Phase 1 of the needed improvements. (City of Wilsonville, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition were identified by ODOT as priorities for inclusion in the financially constrained system. Given limited revenues assumed for the 20-year plan period, construction was not included at this time.

Comment 127: US 26 needs to be expanded to six lanes from Highway 217 to Cornelius Pass road. This improvement will support Oregon's economic recovery and increase the region's ability to move goods, services and people. The new lanes could be designed for high occupancy vehicles or for truck traffic only. (Tim Phillips, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. No change recommended. The October 31, 2003 draft RTP project list includes projects to widen US 26 to six lanes from Highway 217 to 185th

and interchange improvements at Cornelius Pass Road. These improvements are included in Projects #3008, #3009, #3011, and are in the financially constrained system. Project #3005 is a refinement study to complete planning for improvements in the corridor.

Comment 128: Transportation problems in the OHSU area needed to have a regional solution. In addition, it is important to have more time to comment on the proposed amendments; the City of Portland had submitted proposed amendments late so that there was little time to comment on them. He recommended Metro send a clear signal that this Council supports public comment. (David Rutledge, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. The public comment period on the 2004 RTP has been extended until 5 p.m. December 10 to allow more opportunity for public comment on recently recommended amendments.

Comment 129: The RTP does not adequately address transportation needs in the southwest Portland area. The OHSU Tram and improvements to US 26 serve this area, but do not reflect the true needs of the neighborhood. The \$15 million included in the RTP for Tram could be better used to address other, more important needs in the area. (Dr. Pamela Settlegood, President Southwest Hills Residential League, 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: No change recommended. Metro funding has not been specifically targeted to the Tram. The funding assumptions include a mix of primarily local and private sources, including urban renewal funds, traffic impact fees and other sources. Metro recently allocated \$10 million to the City of Portland through the 2004-07 MTIP for use for North Macadam infrastructure improvements. To date Portland has indicated that this money is likely to be used to improve the street network, however, this has not been determined.

PACKET 3 – TECHNICAL UPDATE

See Comment # 1 under the discussion items section.

PACKET 4 – AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION

Comment 130: Update Appendix 4 – Transportation Analysis Zone Assumptions (TAZs), to identify Wilsonville as a Tier 1 or Tier 2 Industrial Area. (City of Wilsonville, 11/21/03 and 12/4/03)

TPAC Recommendation: Agree. Recommend listing Wilsonville under the Tier 2 industrial areas assumptions as this 2040 designation better reflects the characteristics of the industrial lands in this area, particularly with regard to having a developing street system.

CHAPTER 1

Regional Transportation Policy

1.2 Connecting Land Use and Transportation

While the 2040 Growth Concept is primarily a land use planning strategy, the success of the concept, in large part, hinges on implementation of regional transportation policies identified in this plan. The following are descriptions of each of the 2040 Growth Concept land-use components and the transportation system envisioned to serve them. The 2040 Growth Concept land-use components, called 2040 Design Types, are grouped into a hierarchy based on investment priority. Table 1.1 lists each 2040 Design Type, based on this hierarchy. Figure 1.0 shows the adopted Region 2040 Growth Concept Map.

Table 1.1
Hierarchy of 2040 Design Types

| Primary land-use components | Secondary land-use components |
|--|---|
| Central city | <u>Local industrial areas</u> |
| Regional centers | Station communities |
| <u>Regionally significant industrial areas</u> | Town centers |
| Intermodal facilities | Main streets |
| | Corridors |
| Other urban land-use components | Land-use components outside of the urban area |
| Employment areas | Urban reserves |
| Inner neighborhoods | Rural reserves |
| Outer neighborhoods | Neighboring cities |
| | Green corridors |

Source: Metro

1.2.1 Primary Components

The central city, regional centers, regionally significant industrial areas and intermodal facilities are centerpieces of the 2040 Growth Concept, and form the geographic framework for more locally oriented components of the plan. Implementation of the overall growth concept is largely dependent on the success of these primary components. For this reason, these components are the primary focus of 2040 Growth Concept implementation policies and most infrastructure investments.

Central city and regional centers

Portland's central city already forms the hub of the regional economy. Regional centers in suburban locales such as Gresham, Beaverton and Hillsboro are envisioned in the 2040 Growth Concept as complementary centers of regional economic activity. These areas have the region's highest development densities, the most diverse mix of land uses and the greatest concentration of commerce, offices and cultural amenities. They are the most accessible areas in the region by both auto and public transportation, and have very pedestrian-oriented streets.

In the 2040 Growth Concept, the central city is highly accessible by a high-quality public transportation system, multi-modal street network and a regional freeway system of through-routes. Light rail lines

radiate from the central city, connecting to each regional center. The street system within the central city is designed to encourage public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian travel, but also accommodate auto and freight movement. Of special importance are the bridges that connect the east and west sides of the central city, and serve as critical links in the regional transportation system.

Regional centers also feature a high-quality radial transit system serving their individual trade areas and connecting to other centers, as well as light rail connections to the central city. In addition, a fully improved network of multi-modal streets tie regional centers to surrounding neighborhoods and nearby town centers, while regional through-routes will be designed to connect regional centers with one another and to points outside the region. The street design within regional centers encourages public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian travel while also accommodating automobile and freight movement.

Regionally significant Industrial areas and intermodal facilities

Regionally significant Industrial areas serve as “sanctuaries” for long-term industrial activity. A network of major street connections to both the regional freeway system and intermodal facilities primarily serves these areas. Many industrial areas are also served by freight rail, and have good access to intermodal facilities. Freight intermodal facilities, including air and marine terminals, freight rail yards and common carrier truck terminals are areas of regional concern. Access to these areas is centered on rail, the regional freeway system, public transportation, bikeways and key roadway connections.

While industrial activities often benefit from roadway improvements largely aimed at auto travel, there are roadway needs unique to freight movement that are critical to the continued vitality of industrial areas and intermodal facilities.

1.2.2 Secondary components

While more locally oriented than the primary components of the 2040 Growth Concept, town centers, station communities, main streets and corridors are significant areas of urban activity. Because of their density and pedestrian-oriented design, they play a key role in promoting public transportation, bicycling and walking as viable travel alternatives to the automobile, as well as conveniently close services from surrounding neighborhoods. As such, these secondary components are an important part of the region’s strategy for achieving state goals to limit reliance on any one mode of travel and increase walking, bicycling, carpooling, vanpooling and use of transit.

Station communities

Station communities are located along light rail corridors and feature a high-quality pedestrian and bicycle environment. These communities are designed around the transportation system to best benefit from the public infrastructure. While they include some local services and employment, they are mostly residential developments that are oriented toward the central city, regional centers and other areas that can be accessed by rail for most services and employment.

Town centers and main streets

Town centers function as local activity areas that provide close access to a full range of local retail and service offerings within a few miles of most residents. While town centers will not compete with regional centers in scale or economic diversity, they will offer some specialty attractions of regional interest. Although the character of these centers varies greatly, each will function as strong business and civic communities with excellent multi-modal arterial street access and high-quality public transportation with strong connections to regional centers and other major destinations. Main streets feature mixed-use storefront style development that serves the same urban function as town centers, but are located in a linear pattern along a limited number of bus corridors. Main streets feature street designs that emphasize pedestrian, public transportation and bicycle travel.

Local industrial areas

Local industrial areas serve as important centers of local employment and industrial activities. A network of major street connections to both the regional freeway system and intermodal facilities generally serves these areas. Access to these areas is centered on rail, the regional freeway system, public transportation, bikeways and key roadway connections.

While local industrial activities often benefit from roadway improvements largely aimed at auto travel, there are roadway needs unique to freight movement that are critical to the continued vitality of these areas.

Corridors

Corridors will not be as intensively planned as station communities, but similarly emphasize a high-quality bicycle and pedestrian environment and convenient access to public transportation. Transportation improvements in corridors will focus on nodes of activity – often at major street intersections – where transit and pedestrian improvements are especially important. Corridors can include auto-oriented land uses between nodes of activity, but such uses are carefully planned to preserve the pedestrian orientation and scale of the overall corridor design.

CHAPTER 6

Implementation


6.8 Outstanding Issues

6.8.X Regionally Significant Transportation Areas

In 2003, the region determined a need to protect economic development opportunities by ensuring a long-term supply of large industrial sites for future employment. To meet this need, Metro proposed limits on the types and scale of non-industrial activities in industrial areas. A new industrial design type called Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIA) was proposed as a mechanism for enacting these provisions.

As part of this proposal, private investment in areas with the RSIA designation could be encouraged through complementary public investments, such as transportation and other infrastructure improvements. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) already includes many projects and programs needed to meet this objective, but does not distinguish between the existing industrial designation, and the new RSIA designation, which represents a subset of the larger industrial land base.

To better support the increased emphasis on transportation investments in RSIA's, the 2006-09 Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) should include new criteria that places greater emphasis on projects that serve these areas, and result in increased regional and local transportation investments that serve RSIA's. The scheduled 2005-06 update to the RTP should also consider amendments to Chapter 1 policies that govern investment priorities for RSIA's.



**2004 Regional
Transportation Plan
Public
Hearing**

December 4, 2003



METRO

PEOPLE PLACES
OPEN SPACES

Excerpt from December 4, 2003 Metro Council Public Hearing

6.3 **Ordinance No. 03-1024**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Regional Transportation System Plan and the Regional Functional Plan for Transportation to Meet State Planning Requirements.

6.4 **Resolution No. 03-3380**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation to meet Federal Planning Requirements.

6.5 **Resolution No. 03-3381**, For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

6.6 **Resolution No. 03-3382**, For the Purpose of Adopting the Portland Area Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan and 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Motion: | Councilor Park moved to adopt Ordinance No. 03-1024, Resolution Nos. 03-3380, 03-3381 and 03-3382. |
| Seconded: | Councilor Burkholder seconded the motion |

Councilor Park said there had been a variety of issues that had arisen dealing with our local partners. Mr. Cotugno would explain what we were attempting to do and with concurrence of both the Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation bifurcating the process of the federal and state Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.

Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, introduced the four pieces of legislation and showed the relationships between the four. The RTP was adopted and acknowledged by the State Transportation Commission and the State Land Conservation and Development Commission and the Federal Government based upon an August 2000 adoption. The State and Federal governments have different update cycles requirements. The Federal Government has a three-year update requirement and the State has a five-year update requirement. Metro started down the path of doing this update trying to keep the State and Federal Update as a single document. Metro was now proposing to delay the State RTP adoption and stay within their window of five years, which would be August of 2005. Metro can't delay the Federal RTP. They have a three-year window. Their three-year window expires from their approval date of January 26, 2004. Metro had no choice but to do a federal update. Metro had hoped to keep these together to keep the confusion factor down but he was now recommending that we not proceed with the State RTP and therefore, he was proposing that Ordinance No. 03-1024 be withdrawn. The reason for this came up at Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC). TPAC recommended that we not proceed with the State RTP adoption because the State RTP requirements have a more substantive requirement than the Federal RTP requirement does, that is; Metro was extending our plan out to 2025 from 2020. That extra five years needs a good thorough analysis to determine whether or not that system meets the transportation demands and if there were shortfalls to come up with improvements to address those shortfalls. Metro had not done this, what had been done with this RTP was incorporated projects that had gone through some kind of planning process whether it was Metro's Powell Foster planning process or local comprehensive plan planning process which they were now completing in response to our last RTP. Metro was incorporating all of those changes. Metro was not trying to use this to go through a major reevaluation process. They were trying to use this to incorporate things that have been done in the past several years.

For federal purposes it was necessary that we include those in the plan and most importantly it was necessary that we demonstrate that they conform to the air quality requirements. There was a companion resolution, Resolution No. 03-3382, that was the air quality conformity resolution. Metro was proposing that that resolution be continued to next month. The conformity was not done. The work to estimate vehicle emissions was still underway. That will require that the public comment period for that conformity be extended until those results can be published and released and be made available for public comment. That public comment period has been extended until January 8, 2004. The action that they were proposing to proceed with was with Resolution Nos. 03-3380 and 03-3381. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) was the four-year programming of transportation dollars. The policy action Council had already taken in June 2003 was the allocation of a portion of the MTIP that Metro directly controls through Council action. This MTIP incorporates that policy action but as needed provides the greater detail as to which year, which project fall in, which phase, which source of funds. More importantly, it adds in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) funded projects and the TriMet funded projects to provide a complete federal picture of the federally funded projects. The MTIP was up for adoption. The federal RTP was up for adoption. They were proposing to withdraw the ordinance for the State RTP and the air quality conformity would be continued until next month. They had received 126 comments to date on the publication package. Tonight was the close of the public hearing. Tomorrow, they would have a comment and response document to follow the comments that have been received to date that they had been compiling and preparing responses for so that when Council was dealing with the action item Council would have a comment and response recommendation on all of the comments including the hearing comments from tonight's public hearing.

Council President Bragdon opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 03-1024, Resolution Nos. 03-3380, 3381 and 3382. He noted a card from Mayor Eugene Grant, Happy Valley, who had left but submitted a letter.

Dr. Pamela Settlegood, SW Hills Residential Hogue, 4224 SW Melville Portland OR 97239 read her letter into the record (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record). Councilor Park said he didn't think we had money invested in the Tram project. He believed it was strictly City of Portland. He wasn't sure about the Sunset Hwy project. He asked Mr. Cotugno to address what was being proposed by individual jurisdictions and Metro's role and responsibility in that versus what was being perceived. Mr. Cotugno said the federal RTP, the most important component under the federal requirements, was to define what was called the fiscally constrained RTP. That was, what was the total system we can reasonably expect to build out there given all reasonably available funding sources. The monies that Metro allocate was part of that source of funds but a much bigger part were all of the other sources that were raised at the State and local level. We have made assumptions based upon past history how much ODOT money comes into the region and was available to be spent and in this case how much Portland system development charge revenues were paid, how much Portland urban renewal funds go toward transportation projects and in a similar fashion, Washington County MSTIP levy goes into transportation projects. Given all of those other sources around the region, what were the projects that we could expect to be built? Metro doesn't specially have Metro money, the federal funds that we allocate here in the TRAM but Portland does. Therefore, it was part of the overall system that we had identified for this RTP. We do have 10 million dollar of MTIP into the North Macadam infrastructure requirements. Metro had not pinned down yet which infrastructure that \$10 million was going towards, whether it was the streets, the streetcar or the TRAM. Metro had committed it to the overall North Macadam area. To date Portland has indicated that they were likely to request that those be assigned to the streets in the area not the TRAM or the streetcar. That has not been formally concluded yet.

Lenny Anderson, Coalition for a Livable Future/Transit Demand Management (TDM) Subcommittee, 2934 NE 27th Ave Portland OR 97212 expressed the fact that the process had precluded public involvement that they had come to expect from Metro and had been rushed. He was involved more and more as a member of the TPAC subcommittee for TDM. He was presenting a letter for the Coalition for a Livable Future (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record).

Councilor Newman asked if there was a specific project or a list of projects that he objected to in this update or was it just the percentages that were flowing to particular modes? Mr. Anderson responded that he couldn't identify a specific project. There seemed to be a slippage based on deferring to jurisdictions to simply include the ones that they have done. When you add all of those in and look at the resources available, we were spending more money on roads and less on transit. Some of that may be coincidental but that was not the direction we needed to go. Councilor Burkholder said he agreed with Mr. Anderson. What this document reflects was the fact that on the State level there had been new money allocated specifically for highways and bridges and so this document includes that. The other part was a couple of major transit projects; the Airport Max and the Interstate Max were completed. Mr. Anderson still raised the issue up of where were the resources to complete our alternatives to the automobile facilities. There weren't new resources coming from the legislature. They were looking into new resources locally. This document reflects the current funding realities that we were facing. Mr. Anderson added that he thought that was instructive. It was a little disconcerting. Councilor Burkholder concurred.

Don Baack asked for clarification. Since they had received a lot of stuff just today and hadn't been able to put their thoughts down on paper, would the record be open to submit response after today? Council President Bragdon said he thought the record was closed as of today. Mr. Cotugno said the record was advertised as closing today but they had requested the record be extended on the air quality conformity Resolution No. 03-3382 until January 8, 2004. They were proposing to withdraw the ordinance. There will be a whole development process for a new RTP and it will have its own public comment period when the time comes. Council President Bragdon asked Mr. Baack if he was addressing the air quality issue? Mr. Baack said he did not know. He thought there were projects that were in the wrong years. They had only got the information that was being proposed today. Councilor Burkholder said one of the issues was that just yesterday Metro staff received a series of amendments for a project list from the City of Portland. Many of the projects were in this particular area. Had that been available for public comment? The answer was no. He thought by Metro accepting that list it behooved Metro to add some more time to allow people to make comments on the complete document. Those projects hadn't been available for public comment. Councilor Park asked for clarification on continuing the record and staying on track for what needed to be done in order to stay with the federal compliance. Council President Bragdon asked if we could extend the public comment period for two weeks. Councilor Park said they would hit the deadline on January 23, 2004. Mr. Cotugno said he didn't see a problem with extending the deadline until next Wednesday. He picked that date because JPACT was next Thursday. They had hoped to close the comment period today because TPAC was tomorrow. TPAC can make provisional recommendations. Council President Bragdon said the record would be extended until December 10th.

Don Baack, Hillsdale Neighborhood Association, 6495 SW Burlingame Place Portland OR 97239 read his letter into the record. Councilor Newman reiterated his concerns about connections to I-405. He noted that there was a lot of traffic going from southeast Portland but also through Clackamas County that went through Mr. Baack's neighborhood and were forced to go over the Taylors Ferry Tewilliger route to get to Washington County. The connection between the Ross

Island Bridge and I-405 particularly in the Arthur-Carruthers section was so backed up. He remembered the South Portland circulation plan that dealt with the redesign of Naito Parkway actually had fly over ramps that connected Ross Island Bridge and North Macadam to 405. Mr. Baack said he was on that committee and it was the major thing that most of the committee could agree on. The rest of it was much less important. Councilor Newman said the issue of funding it was a big mystery. He supported Mr. Baack's contention that it was a huge problem that was not just local but regional. His testimony was submitted by email (a copy of which is included in the meeting record).

Glenn Bridger, Southwest Neighborhoods Inc, a coalition of 16 neighborhoods in southwest, 940 SW Vincent Pkwy Portland OR 97219 said southwest Portland was hurting in terms of transportation infrastructure. He summarized his testimony (a copy of his letter is included in the meeting record)

Morgan Will, 3817 N Williams Ave Portland OR 97227. He said he was a resident of the Boise Neighborhood in north Portland. He was here to comment on the I-84 Trail. It was regional trail #37. He wanted to advocate for its inclusion on the constrained funding list. He spoke to the benefits of the trail for the region. The trail goes from the river to I-205. It was also suggested to go beyond to connect to a leg by 122nd. This trail would connect the downtown, the Rose Quarter, the Lloyd District, Hollywood District, 82nd Avenue, and Gateway. This was a regional trail that would help meet many of the goals of the 2040 Growth Concept. There were about 14 neighborhoods on the inner eastside of Portland that will be connected by this trail. Within a quarter mile of its route there were about 15 parks and 23 schools and playgrounds. The trail would link up to all Max stations that go through that corridor starting at the Rose Quarter Transit Center ending at the Gateway Transit Center. It would make easy bicycle connections to about 22 bus lines. There were about 16 city bikeways that cross or are next to the corridor that would help link users of the bike network to regional trails and regional resources such as the I-205 trail and eastside esplanade, OMSI to Springwater. People will be able to walk along the trail from their neighborhoods to services. He had walked the whole length of the route several times. He had counted about 50 access points. It would be an easily accessible trail for residents. There were also 17 bridges where people could get from the south side of the Banfield Corridor over to get to the trail. He had been advocating for this trail. A lot of people were excited about the trail. He was a Portland State University student studying urban and regional planning. He had been doing some research about the potential for this trail. He had done a mock grant application for it. He felt this project would help access in the region. He was working with a professor of Transportation Engineering at PSU in cooperation with some city planners and Metro trail planners to have a Senior Engineering Capstone course to have a look at this trail from an engineering standpoint. They should be getting some output from that course at the end of the winter term. It was good time to make it fundable. There were some requests for some feasible study. He encouraged that this be approved. Council President Bragdon asked if this trail wasn't in the RTP. Councilor Monroe had made a motion to include this in the RTP. Mr. Will explained that this was about two years ago. The trail was put on the RTP as a proposed trail but the idea now was that it moved into the financially constrained list, which makes it available to get funding toward it. It makes it more of a priority for funding as funding arises. It needed to have a feasibility study. Councilor Newman asked where it had to be in the RTP to get any kind of funding?


David Redlich, Homestead Neighborhood Association, 3444 SW Condor Ave Portland OR 97239 expressed concern about how the meeting was run. He felt they needed to find a better way for public hearings. He felt public participation was being stymied. He opposed the Urban Growth Boundary expansion. If they needed industrial land, they should use the existing paved parking

lots in the region. He suggested micro business orientations for industrial land. He supported comments made by Glenn Bridger. He said the OHSU solution needed to be a regional solution. He commented on the extension of public hearing to December 10th. He said the City of Portland had submitted documents late so that there was little time to comment on them. He recommended Metro send a clear signal that this Council supported public comment.

Jay Mower, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, 7040 NE 4th Ave, Portland OR 97218 read his letter into the record (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record).

Council President Bragdon closed the public hearing.

Councilor Newman asked the Mr. Cotugno respond to his question about trail funding. Mr. Cotugno explained that any federal funds that get allocated have to be consistent with a adopted fiscally constrained air quality conformed RTP. If you desire to allocate money to a project through the next MTIP round, then it would have to be part of this fiscally constrained air quality conformed RTP or get added to the fiscally constrained air quality conformed RTP. We have done amendments as part of the MTIP adoption in the past. The biggest hurdle was the air quality conformity because of the expense. A highway capacity expansion project would require new emission estimates to determine their air quality conformity. Trail and transit projects were all exempt projects so you wouldn't need to do the air quality conformity. You do need to take formal action to amend the RTP. Councilor Newman said the trail that was brought up was something that was added to the RTP but not the financially constrained RTP? Mr. Cotugno said yes. Councilor Burkholder asked what the process was to add a feasibility study for a trail to a fiscally constrained list. How would that happen in the next two weeks or in time for this update? Mr. Cotugno said the feasibility study wasn't the issue. The real issue was the financial caps. Kim Ellis responded that a feasibility study would be about \$50,000. She said staff was recommending adding some of the trails to the financially constrained system. We have been compiling a list of all of the comments received, developing staff recommendations, which would be forwarded to TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council for approval. Councilor Newman asked if the project related to Milwaukie, Oak Grove and Lake Oswego was recommended for the financially constrained list? Ms. Ellis said the request was added to the project list so it had been added to the preferred system. It was not recommended for inclusion in the financially constrained system. Councilor Park commented on testimony on Title 4 and RTP.



2004 Regional Transportation Plan **Written Comments**

**Received Oct. 31, 2003
through Dec. 4, 2003**



METRO

PEOPLE PLACES
OPEN SPACES

Henry Kane
12077 SW Camden Lane
Beaverton, Oregon 97008
503.643-4054

October 4, 2003

Kim Ellis
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Re: Regional Transportation Plan Update response

Dear Metro:

Please stop wasting taxpayer money on so-called "light rail" and "commuter rail" white elephants.

Per million dollars spent, freeway improvements will produce more new transportation capacity, including trucks, than mass transit.

Mass transit "True Believers" continuously overstate ridership and understate capital and operating costs. The Beaverton-Wilsonville "commuter rail" project from nowhere to nowhere, originally was estimated to cost about \$70 million; the latest estimate is \$120 million-plus.

My understanding is that the Highway 217 task force is considering a so-called "high occupancy lane." That deprives motorists of the use of traffic lanes they have financed, does little to reduce congestion, and increases congestion.

My further understanding is that Metro intends to issue revenue bonds totaling \$15 million as its "share" of the Beaverton-Wilsonville commuter rail project.

Subject to legal research my preliminary view is that revenue bonds must be repaid from the project the revenue bonds finance.

I will attend the Thursday, December 4, 2003 meeting starting at 2 p.m. Parenthetically, most people work at that time. I suggest that at least one public hearing start at 7 p.m.

Sincerely,

Henry Kane
C: Metro Counsel D. B. Cooper



*Community Development
Shaping A Better Community*

MEMORANDUM

CITY OF TIGARD

TO: Kim Ellis/Tom Kloster, Metro

FROM: Gus Duenas, City of Tigard

DATE: October 31, 2003

SUBJECT: RTP updates – financially constrained system

In a previous memo, Tigard provided you with our recommended updates to the RTP, including several projects to be added to the financially constrained system. Since that time, it has become evident that limited funding will not allow for all of the requested projects to be placed on the financially constrained system.

After discussing this issue internally, and with the understanding that Metro plans to conduct a more rigorous and detailed update to the RTP next year, Tigard is changing the recommendation that both the Washington Square Regional Center over-crossings be added to the financially constrained system at this time. It is our intent to request that both of these regionally significant projects be added to the financially constrained system during the next RTP update.

The following is a summary of Tigard's updated request:

Projects to be added to the RTP:

The following projects are identified in the Tigard Transportation System Plan, serve a regional center or town center, and serve a regional need and Tigard requests that these be included in the RTP update.

Add the Washington Square Regional Center Greenbelt Trail to the Regional Bicycle System Map and include the project in the funding systems.

Explanation: The portion from Hall to Greenburg received funding on this past MTIP allocation for design and the portion from Hall to 217 also received funding for construction. Funding will be requested in the future to complete construction of the portion between 217 and Greenburg and to complete remaining segments. Estimated cost for filling in trail gaps is approximately

\$2 million (from Washington Square Implementation Plan). Tigard requests that this be added to the financially constrained system.

Walnut Street extension east of 99W to meet Hall Blvd. and Hunziker.

Explanation: The Tigard TSP identifies a connection of Walnut east of 99W to meet Hall Boulevard and Hunziker Street. The estimated cost is \$19 million. This would serve the Tigard Town Center area.

Projects to be added to Financially Constrained System

The following projects are not currently on the financially constrained system and Tigard is requesting that they be added:

(no RTP project #) Washington Square Regional Center Greenbelt Trail

Explanation: The portion from Hall to Greenburg received funding on this past MTIP allocation for design and the portion from Hall to 217 also received funding for construction. Funding will be requested in the future to complete construction of the portion between 217 and Greenburg and to complete remaining segments. Estimated cost for filling in trail gaps is approximately \$2 million (From Washington Square Implementation Plan).

RTP project # 6011 – Hwy 217 over-crossing - South Mall to Nimbus Connection (Nimbus to Locust Street).

Explanation: This project is identified as the 3rd priority in the Washington Square Regional Center Plan and is entirely within Tigard's jurisdiction. Given recent development proposals in this area, it may be more important to construct this project than other higher priority projects if additional funding is made available. In addition, a connection in this area will also complement the commuter rail project by providing better east/west connections to the Regional Center area. The transportation improvements within the Regional Center will ease existing congestion on State facilities (Hwy 217 and Hall Blvd). Estimated cost for construction (design to construction) is \$26 million.

Projects Critical to remain on the Financially Constrained System

In addition, Tigard supports the following projects being maintained on the financially constrained system:

- RTP project #6009 – Highway 217 Corridor Study
- RTP project #6014 – Greenburg Rd improvements
- RTP project #6015 – Greenburg Rd improvements, North
- RTP project #6016 – Greenburg Rd improvements, South
- RTP project #6034 – Walnut Street Improvements, Phase 3
- RTP project #6040 – 72nd Avenue Improvements, 99W to Hunziker Rd
- RTP project #6041 – 72nd Avenue Improvements, Hunziker Rd to Bonita rd
- RTP project #6042 – 72nd Avenue Improvements, Bonita Rd to Durham Rd

Projects to be removed from the Financially Constrained System

A few projects in Tigard on the Financially Constrained system have been constructed and can be removed from the Financially Constrained system:

RTP project #6033 – Walnut Street Improvements, Phase I
Reason - Completed (\$2,021,250 estimated project cost)

RTP project # 6046 – Walnut Street Improvements, Phase II
Reason – Completed (\$6,601,356 estimated project cost)

Project clarifications for RTP

Tigard has identified several clarification issues that need to be addressed in the RTP update. Below is a description of the issues with the necessary clarifications underlined.

RTP project # 6011 is listed on the RTP project list, however it is not identified on the RTP map or in the text of the RTP. Also, this project should be a Tigard jurisdiction as well as ODOT. This is the South Mall to Nimbus Connection identified in the Regional Center Plan. The Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$26 million.

RTP project # 6032 is listed on the RTP project list, however it is not identified on the RTP map or in the text of the RTP. The project description in Tigard's TSP states: "Realign Hunziker Road to meet Hampton at 72nd Avenue – requires overcrossing over ORE 217 - removes existing 72nd/Hunziker intersection." The TSP estimates the cost for this improvement at \$10 million.

RTP project #6052 should have both Tigard and Beaverton under the jurisdiction as it enters both Cities. The project location is Nimbus Drive to Northern Mall area. The Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$30 million.

RTP project #6053 – the Washington Square Implementation Plan identifies this project cost at approximately \$38 million.

A few **discrepancies** were noted between the RTP and TSP in the functional classification: Beef Bend, Gaarde and Walnut from Gaarde to Scholls are arterials in the TSP but listed as a collectors in the RTP. When Tigard adopted the TSP, it was acknowledged that these discrepancies exist.

Thank you for considering Tigard's comments in the RTP update process. We look forward to reviewing and commenting on the draft documents.

CC: Clark Barry, Washington County
Jim Hendryx, City of Tigard
Barbara Shields, City of Tigard
Julia Hajduk, City of Tigard

Subject: RTP Update: Discrepancies/Omissions/Corrections: Final Version**Date:** Thursday, November 6, 2003 9:33 AM**From:** Thomas.J.PICCO@odot.state.or.us

o: ellisk@metro.dst.or.us

Cc: Robin.L.MCARTHUR@odot.state.or.us, Lidwien.RAHMAN@odot.state.or.us,

Frederick.C.EBERLE@odot.state.or.us

Kim -- sorry for the late submittal. I have reviewed the Metro and ODOT RTP project lists, and identified apparent differences. Some assorted discrepancies between ODOT and Metro Financially-Constrained (FC) lists. Some adjustments to projects proposed by City of Portland (CoP) for ODOT's list. See attached spreadsheet of ODOT projects in RTP FC list, and Expanded Financially-Constrained list. Items in spreadsheet highlighted in yellow indicate new cost estimates, or projects split into two projects; items highlighted in green indicate projects have been proposed for another category than earlier drafts, and/or are in different category than RTP assignment; items highlighted in red (Glencoe Interchange project phases) are proposed for FC and Expanded FC categories, since within Metro AQ boundary, but not Metro Planning boundary. More specific information on selected projects are explained below. If you have any questions, give me a call @ 731-8230.

<<RTP2000ODOT_6.xls>>

RTP # Project Description >> Discrepancy

>> Recommendations

1024 I-5/McLoughlin Ramps (\$23.1M/\$18.4M ODOT)>>On Metro's FC list; On ODOT & CoP's Expanded FC list .>>Move project to Expanded FC.

1030 Ross Island Bridgehead (\$5.1M/\$4.1M ODOT) >>On Metro & ODOT's FC list; On Cop's Expanded FC list. >>Move project to Expanded FC

4037 Columbia/Lomb. Intersections @ MLK (\$0.81M? or \$2M MTIP PE?) >>Metro moved to Preferred; Not on ODOT or CoP FC list; some confusion by Port re: which RTP project received MTIP funds (#4015 study; #4030 11th/13th St. Connector; or #4037 Lomb./Columbia intersections>>Place appropriate MTIP project in FC - \$0 ODOT.

3011 US 26 Murray to 185th (\$12.3M?)>>On Metro's FC list, as well as overlapping #3009 Murray to Cornell (on ODOT's FC list); #3011 is on ODOT's Expanded FC as Cornell to 185th >>Split #3011 Murray to 185th project into segments, keep # 3009 (Murray to Cornell) on FC list (new cost est. ODOT/Wash. Co. IGA: \$8.37M/ODOT \$1.241M + \$4.7M OTIA/\$2.409M non-ODOT), and move Cornell to 185th (# 3011?) to Expanded FC (\$11.63M/\$9.3M ODOT; \$2.36M non-ODOT).

3129 Glencoe Interchange (\$13.8M)>># 3129A on ODOT's FC list for PE/EA (\$0.500M - all ODOT), and on Preferred List for ROW & Construction, but Metro has dropped from RTP completely since project is outside Metro planning area boundary -- although within Metro Air Quality Monitoring Area boundary >>Move # 3129 (construction: \$13.8M - \$11.04M ODOT) & #3129B (R-o-W: \$2.0M/\$1.6M ODOT) from Preferred to Expanded FC., if appropriate to be included in RTP at all, for modeling?

2028 Powell Blvd. Improve. - 174th to Burnside (\$21M) >>On Metro's FC list; ODOT had moved from FC to Preferred List (\$11.9M/ODOT \$0/OTIA \$5.25M)>>propose split project into segments: #2028: 174th to Eastman Parkway(\$11.9M/ODOT \$0 + \$5.25M OTIA) to FC list, and # 2028A?: Eastman Parkway to Burnside (difference from \$21M ? = \$9.1M/\$7.28M ODOT) to Expanded FC.

5135 McLoughlin Blvd. Improve. Ph. 1 (I-205 to 10th) - Oregon City (\$5.85M/ODOT \$0) >>On Metro's FC list; ODOT moved from FC to Preferred List >>move to Expanded FC

6005? I-5/99W Connector Ph. 1 Arterial Connector (\$53.0M/\$43.0M ODOT) >>On ODOT FC list. Not included in Metro FC or Preferred List. (RTP # 6005 I-5/99W connector Ph. 2 Freeway [\$288.75M] is on Metro's Preferred list) >>Add I-5/99W Connector Ph. 1 Arterial Connection to FC list to assure modeling of Ph. 1

New Hwy 217 Improvements - braid SB on-ramp from BH Hwy with SB off-ramp to Allen Blvd. (\$15M/\$12M ODOT) >>On ODOT's Expanded FC list. Not on Metro's FC or Preferred lists >> Place on Expanded FC



CITY OF
PORTLAND
OFFICE OF
TRANSPORTATION

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
(503) 823-5185
FAX (503) 823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD (503) 823-6868

Brant Williams
Director

November 12, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kloster, Metro
From: Deena Platman, Transportation Planning
CC: Laurel Wentworth, John Gillam
Subject: Comments on draft 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update Documents

I have taken the opportunity to review the four update documents that comprise the 2004 RTP update and have the following comments:

1 - Policy Update

- The street design section has N Ivanhoe (Richmond to Philadelphia) updated to Community Street. This item should be removed from the list because the existing classification is Community Street.
- McLoughlin Blvd - Urban Road termini should change from SE 17th - City limits to Woodward - 17th.
- N Richmond (Lombard to Ivanhoe) should remain a Community Street.
- NE Sandy's termini for the Regional Street classification should change from 12th - 47th to 54th - 57th. The street design classification should change from Regional Blvd to Regional Street.
- NE Sandy's Regional Blvd classification termini should change from 47th - 82nd to 57th - 82nd.
- Sandy Blvd (98th - 122nd) is classified as a Regional Blvd in the 2000 RTP not a Community Blvd.
- SE 17th termini for Community Blvd should change from Tacoma - Andover to Tacoma - Linn.
- NE/SE 39th termini for the Regional Street classification should change from Broadway - Powell to Broadway - Holgate.
- SE 39th termini for Community Street should change from Powell - Woodstock to Holgate - Woodstock.

2 - Project Update

- Update the project names for the streetcar projects as follows:
 - #1015 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3a (RiverPlace)
 - #1086 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3b (Gibbs)
 - #1087 - Portland Streetcar - Phase 3c (Bancroft)
 - #1106 - Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 1 (Lloyd District)
 - #1107 - Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 2 (CEID)

Eileen Argentina
System Management

Don Gardner
Engineering & Development

Jeanne Nyquist
Maintenance

Richard Steinbrugge
Finance

Laurel Wentworth
Planning

- #1199 - Barbur Blvd Pedestrian Access to Transit Improvements should be moved to the Preferred System. The I-5/Barbur Corridor Study will precede improvements in this corridor.
- #2016 - NE Halsey Bikeway should be moved to the Preferred System. Due to right-of-way constraints, the project needs additional study to determine feasibility. The Tillamook Bike Boulevard provides an alternative route through this section of northeast Portland.
- #4015 - US-30 Bypass Improvements Study should be combined with #4037. Delete #4015.
- #4030 - NE 11-13th Avenue Connector should be combined with #4037. Delete #4030.
- #4037 - Columbia and Lombard Intersection Improvements should be updated as follows:

Name: Lombard - Columbia Connection near MLK Jr Blvd.

Description: Improve road connection between Columbia Blvd and Lombard in the vicinity of MLK Jr Blvd to 11th/13th, to facilitate freight movement.

Est. Cost: \$16, 835,000

Jurisdiction: Portland/Port

RTP Program Years: 2004 - 2009

3 - Technical Update

No changes

4 - Air Quality Conformity

No changes

Subject: RTP update problem

Date: Monday, November 17, 2003 1:44 PM

From: Platman, Deena <Deena.Platman@pdxtrans.org>

To: "Kim Ellis (E-mail)" ellisk@metro.dst.or.us

Cc: "Gillam, John" John.Gillam@pdxtrans.org

Hey Kim,

I'm yet again looking at the update list and I found a problem. #1106 is now the Eastside Streetcar Phase 1 but we still need the original Eastside Streetcar Feasibility Study that this project replaced. This study is actually separate from the Portland Streetcar, Eastside project. The idea is to look at extending the streetcar into neighborhoods outside of Central City.

Can you add this back in as a new # and put it into the preferred system?

Deena

Deena Platman
Transportation Planner
City of Portland
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Room 800
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 823-7567
deena.platman@pdxtrans.org



WASHINGTON COUNTY OREGON

Nov. 20, 2003

To: Kim Ellis, Metro
From: Clark Berry *CB*
Subject: **Revisions to RTP Project List**

Attached are suggested changes to the RTP Project List (10/31/03 Public Comment Draft). Changes are grouped into one of three categories consisting of Project Description Revisions, Project Additions and Project Deletions. Many of the proposed changes are requested to maintain consistency between this RTP update and the Washington County Transportation Plan adopted in Oct. 2002.

Project Description Revisions

#1185 – Change program years to 2004-09 to reflect scheduled project completion under MSTIP3 in 2004/05.

#3011 – Change project description to read Cornell to 185th to be consistent with #3009.

#3036 – Change cost estimate to \$12.7 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#3066 and #3067 - Change 2040 link from Beaverton Corridor to Bethany TC.

#3069 – Change location to Allen to Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy. and cost estimate to \$13.3 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#3099 – Change jurisdiction to Washington County because road is planned to remain part of Countywide Road System (i.e., is and will be under County's roadway jurisdiction) and change cost estimate to \$14.8 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#3103 – Change project location to 185th to Brookwood and cost estimate to \$34.8 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#3115 – Change jurisdiction to Wash. Co. to reflect current roadway jurisdictional responsibility.

#3133 – Change project description to read "Construct eastbound on-ramp, westbound off-ramp and southbound auxiliary lane" to reflect anticipated improvements already funded under OTIA.

#3137 – Change cost estimate to \$12.5 million to reflect County Transportation Plan.

#3142 – Change project location to read "170th to Cornelius Pass" with an estimated cost of \$21 million and program year of 2010-15.

#3149 – Change project description to read “Relocate westbound on-ramp to construct westbound to southbound loop ramp and widen overcrossing to accommodate additional southbound through-lane”.

#3174 – Change project location to “Leahy to 84th Ave.” and project description to “widen to 5 lanes...” to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#3176 – Change project name to 95th Avenue Extension.

#3180 – Change project description to read “Construct new collector with sidewalks and bike lanes”

#3186 – Change project location to read “Hwy. 26 to Cornell” to be consistent with new proposed MSTIP project.

#3188 – Change project location to read “Cornell to Laidlaw” to be consistent with new proposed MSTIP project.

#3199 – For consistency with County Transportation Plan, change project location to read “143rd Avenue to future Springville Extension” and change cost estimate to \$21.3 million.

#3202 – For consistency with County Transportation Plan, change project location to read “Future Springville Extension to Cornelius Pass” and include cost estimate of \$12.4 million.

#3209 – Change 2040 link from Tanasbourne TC to Bethany TC.

#3214 – Delete phrase “complete boulevard design improvements” from project description because project is not designated for boulevard design considerations in County Transportation Plan.

#3215 – Change cost estimate to \$15.4 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#6030 – Change cost estimate to \$41.6 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

#6043 – Change cost estimate to \$8.2 million to be consistent with County Transportation Plan.

Project Additions

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of 209th from Kinnaman to Farmington Rd. @ \$21 million in the 2010-2015 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of 173rd from Bronson to Meadowgrass to 3 lanes with bikelanes and sidewalks @ \$13.9 million in the 2016-25

time period. This project is the continuation of RTP project #3205 the 173rd/174th undercrossing of Hwy. 26. This route is also designated as an arterial road in both the 2000 RTP and the County's Transportation Plan.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Springville Rd. from 185th to PCC access to 5 lanes @ \$3.8 million in the 2010-15 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Springville Rd. from PCC access to Kaiser Rd. to 3 lanes @ \$9.6 million in the 2016-25 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Laidlaw Rd. from West Union to Kaiser to 3 lanes @ \$11 million in the 2010-15 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Kaiser Rd. from Bethany Blvd. to Cornell Rd. to 3 lanes @ \$18.6 million in the 2010-15 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Kaiser Rd. from Springville to Bethany Blvd. to 5 lanes @ \$4.6 million in the 2016-25 time period.

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of Jenkins Rd. from Murray to 185th to five lanes @ \$7.3 million in the 2010-15 time period (this may already be on the list but I couldn't find it).

New project – Add to Preferred System the widening of 197th/198th from TV Hwy. to Baseline to 3 lanes @\$13.9 million in the 2016-25 time period. This is identified as a collector of regional significance in the 2000 RTP and is included in the County's Transportation Plan project list.

New project – Add to Preferred System "Cornelius Pass Interchange Improvement @ Hwy. 26 to add northbound to westbound loop ramp". Estimated cost is \$30 million and program year is 2016-25.

New project – To be consistent with County Transportation Plan, add to Preferred System "Widen Barnes Rd. from Leahy to County Line to 3 lanes for \$7.5 million in 2016-25 time period".

Project Deletions

#3024 – Delete project on Hwy. 26 from Cornell to 185th which duplicates revised #3011.

#3043 – Delete seven-lane project on Walker Rd. from Cedar Hills to Murray because need shown in Wash. Co. Transportation Plan is only five lanes.

If you have questions or if any of these proposed changes conflict with other proposed changes you have received from Washington County jurisdictions, please call me at 503 846-3876 so we can reconcile the conflict before revising the RTP. Thanks.

F:\USERS\CLARKB\WPDATA\RTPI\Project list revisions.doc



November 20, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Ellis, Senior Transportation Planner, Metro
FROM: John Wiebke, Urban Planner

RE: **2004 Regional Transportation Plan Update**

Upon review of the latest 2004 RTP Update draft language, the City has the following comments:

1. New projects added to the preferred and financially constrained lists for Hillsboro have RTP program years out to 2016-2025. The projects in question are:
 - RTP 3099 (1st Avenue/Glencoe Road widening)
 - RTP 3118 (TV Highway/Brookwood Avenue intersection alignment)
 - RTP 3117 (Grant Street East-West connector/extension to Brookwood Pkwy)
 - RTP 3139 (US 26 over crossing at 229th Avenue)

The program years for all these projects should be moved up to 2004-2009. In particular, Project 3118 (TV Highway/Brookwood Avenue) is the City's top priority and should be programmed for 2004-2009.

2. Table 1.3 of the 2000 RTP specifies the following non-SOV modal targets for 2040 land use types:
 - 45-55% for regional/town centers, main streets, station communities, and corridors.
 - 40-45% for industrial/employment areas, intermodal facilities and inner/outer neighborhoods.

Non-SOV modal target is an outstanding issue that was never thoroughly resolved when the 2000 RTP was adopted. How do we measure jurisdiction compliance? Are the targets achievable? These and other questions are what this section is trying to address. Therefore, it would be advisable to seek clarification on this topic from Metro staff during the next TPAC meeting.



CLACKAMAS COUNTY

Board of Commissioners

BILL KENNEMER
CHAIR

LARRY SOWA
COMMISSIONER

MARTHA SCHRADER
COMMISSIONER

November 21, 2003

The Honorable Brian Newman
Metro Councillor
Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Brian:

Re: Support for Tillamook Branch Trestle Addition to RTP

We are writing in support for the concept of adding the Tillamook Branch Trestle to the RTP being considered early next month. We understand that grant funds may be available and see this as a potentially important project. We also understand that the 4C Technical Advisory Committee has also expressed support.

The concept of an east/west connector and pedestrian path has great appeal and could be another step in better connecting our County that sometimes feels divided by the Willamette River. We see the potential of future pedestrian, bike and multi-uses that could join with other trail systems and networks being developed. An additional benefit is preserving the trestle as a possible commuter rail alignment in the future, another means of connecting our County. And, we also like the idea of preserving the trestle, an old, established Clackamas County landmark that links two of our important cities.

Please consider this project as you move the RTP forward.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bill Kennemer".

Bill Kennemer
Chair

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Larry Sowa".

Larry Sowa
Commissioner

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Martha Schrader".

Martha Schrader
Commissioner

Cc: The Honorable James Bernard
The Honorable Judie Hammerstad
BK/cm

November 21, 2003

Kim Ellis
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97232



30000 SW Town Center Loop E
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070
(503) 682-1011
(503) 682-1015 Fax
(503) 682-0843 TDD

RE: RTP Update Public Comments

Dear Ms. Ellis:

The City of Wilsonville has several preliminary comments regarding the draft 2004 RTP Update. They are as follows:

1. As submitted at the October 29, 2003 TPAC Workshop, the City of Wilsonville has re-evaluated two project priorities since the last update of the financially constrained list and they would include the following changes to the draft 2004 RTP:
 - Remove project #6091, the Boeckman Road I-5 Overcrossing, from the financially constrained list and move it to the preferred system. The project total in the draft RTP is \$9,890,000.
 - Add project #6093, the Barber Street extension to the financially constrained list. The project total in the draft RTP is \$7,310,000.

As you can see, this would remove a burden of over 2.5 million dollars from the financially constrained system. The Barber Street Extension project was determined to be a higher priority project because of its ability to have a greater impact on providing relief to the Wilsonville Road Interchange. This was concluded as part of the *I-5/Wilsonville Freeway Access Study*, which was prepared by DKS Associates in November of 2002 in coordination with ODOT, Metro, and the City of Wilsonville.

2. Appendix 4 – Transportation Analysis Zone Assumptions, does not list Wilsonville as an Industrial Area (pg. 3) under 2040 Grouping. I suggest that we be included as a Tier 1 or, at least, as a Tier 2.
3. The City is currently reviewing the proposed Policy Map Amendments for compliance with the City of Wilsonville Transportation Systems Plan. If there are any modifications needed, we will forward these to you before December 4, 2003.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these preliminary comments on the draft 2004 RTP Update. If you have any questions, please call me at (503) 682-4960.

Sincerely,

Laurel Byer, PE
Assistant City Engineer

LB:



November 21, 2003

To: TPAC
From: Andy Back, Washington County

Re: Recommendations on the 2004 Regional transportation plan

Below are our comments on the draft 2004 RTP. While we are supportive of going forward with adopting an RTP that meets federal regulations, we do not believe adopting an RTP that is adopted by ordinance and attempts to meet the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule is necessary. Simply, we believe it would be irresponsible for TPAC to recommend adoption of a "state" RTP given the level of effort that has gone into this planning exercise. There is no compelling reason to do this now. Instead, we urge that TPAC recommend the following to JPACT:

1. *Proceed with adoption of the federal RTP*
2. *At this time, do not adopt a revised RTP that attempts to meet the Transportation Planning Rule and other state land use requirements.*
3. *Direct Metro staff to establish a work program for undertaking a comprehensive update of the RTP. The initial task in this effort would be the development of a coordinated, thoroughly reviewed 2025 forecast.*

The Washington County Coordinating Committee – Transportation Advisory Committee met and discussed this issue at their November 21, 2003 meeting. The WCCC-TAC agrees in principal with these recommendations. To date, we have not unearthed any fatal flaw to this approach. However, both the County and the WCCC-TAC hope that this approach continues to be looked at prior to formal adoption.

Reasons for our recommendation

Metro staff has described this effort as a "minor " update. We believe "minor" is a very subjective term. The plan is based on a new 2025 population and employment forecast, which, to date, has had absolutely no review by Washington County, and, to our knowledge, any other local governments in the Metro area. The forecast is essential in driving the development of the rest of the plan. We have no way to determine whether

or not this Forecast reasonably reflects the amount and location of future growth, and in turn, no way to determine whether or not the expected travel demand on the assumed transportation system is reasonable. To use an old, but appropriate analogy, adopting a new state RTP is like building a house without any knowledge of the quality of the foundation. This new 2025 forecast is a quantifiable vision of what the region looks like 20 years from now. Yet, the vision remains hidden and unreviewed. While it may be a good first draft, it's certainly unrealistic to assume that it will be endorsed, much less embraced, as a "shared vision" without months of rigorous review by local governments. Moreover, Statewide Planning Goal 2 requires an adequate factual base in order to make land use decisions. In this case, we don't believe an adequate factual base has been established.

The primary benefit, to local governments, in adopting a "state" RTP at this time is for simplicity sake. It is easy to explain to the public and others that there is just one single Regional Transportation Plan, and that it meets both Federal and State requirements. But, as we all know, transportation planning and funding is complex and is not simple. While having two Regional Transportation Plans may marginally add to the complexity, at this time, the benefits of one single Regional Transportation Plan simply don't outweigh the costs and problems that adopting a new state RTP may create.

Our concerns are primarily a result of reviewing the "Technical Update" dated October 31, 2003 (document #3 of 4). Our concerns include, but aren't limited to:

Page 6-5 660.012.00206-5 – Here is the beginning discussion about how the TSP adequately serves regional transportation needs. First off, because we haven't been part of a rigorous forecast or modeling development exercise, we have no idea what needs we are talking about in 2025. We have not seen any modeling results to understand whether or not the RTP adequately addresses those needs.

Page 6-5 660.012.0025 – It's stated here that this is the first regional RTP. While we hope that a new one isn't adopted, wouldn't this be the second?

Page 6-6 660.012.0030 – Determination of transportation needs. There is no evidence that this RTP followed these requirements.

Page 6-6 660.012.0035 – Define what a “minor” update is. In the bottom paragraph, it’s stated that the Preferred System is adequate to meet state and regional travel needs. To date, we have seen no data that makes this case. And, if we ultimately do see the data, it will likely be from a modeling and analysis exercise that did not involve local governments.

Page 6-6 660.012.0035(4) – So, how does this RTP address the modal targets? Are we making progress or losing ground? Is it a result of the transportation improvements in this plan, or different underlying population and employment assumptions in the individual TAZ’s? Isn’t this a future update of the RTP? So, has it adequately expanded on alternative measures?

Page 6-13, Chapter 2 – This states that local plans must be consistent with the 2025 population and employment forecasts. After several years, we finally developed and adopted an acknowledged plan that was based on the 2020 forecast. So, now what? Do we have to use the 2025 forecast for plan amendments? Do we need to use the new forecast for designing road projects? The more fundamental issue is we have no idea what is in the 2025 forecast or how it differs from the 2020 forecast.

Page 6-48, 6.7.7 Areas of Special Concern – Given the amount of congestion anticipated by the 2000 RTP, these are particular areas of the plan with which County staff has considerable concern. Simply, without a thorough analysis, it’s very difficult to say how existing areas of special concern have changed and whether there would be more areas of special concern. However, as a result of more growth and a different pattern of growth as indicated in a new 2025 forecast, there may be entirely new Areas of Special Concern where regional performance measures can not be met. We believe it’s irresponsible to go forward with a new RTP without a thorough analysis and public understanding of this issue.

If Metro does proceed with adopting a new state RTP, we believe the RTP should include those Deficiency Areas found in the County’s transportation plan that aren’t in the RTP. These additional Deficiency Areas (the County’s different, but probably more accurate term for Areas of Special Concern) include two portions of Cornell Road, Murray Boulevard from Walker to Beard, Farmington road from Hocken to 170th, Washington Square Regional Center, Beaverton Regional Center, and a corridor between Scholls Ferry and Hwy 99W. We would suspect there are other locations

outside of Washington County that don't meet the adopted performance measures.

6-58 Defining System Adequacy - We're not sure why there is a need to highlight this specific issue at this time. 660.012.0060 is clear that plan amendments need to be evaluated against planned transportation improvements. To us, that is clearly the "preferred" system. Very little land development is dependent on a plan amendment in order to proceed. Thus, we believe the larger issue is how well is the financially constrained system keeping up with actual development. It is a much, much larger issue than what the precise words of 660.012.0060 actually mean. We believe this discussion needs to be broader, and not limited to evaluating local plan amendments.

Other issues

We are unsure, given the lack of analysis and coordination in developing the forecast, how Metro will make findings that this "new" RTP is consistent with the all of the policies in the current acknowledged State RTP. Several other parts of the RTP would need to be updated.

Here are some, but not all, of the Policies for which we believe it will be difficult to make findings:

Policy 1.0 Public Involvement – Given the "fast-track" nature of this RTP amendment process, it seems at odds with this policy. There simply isn't enough time to revise the plans based on public comment, as appropriate.

Policy 2.0 Intergovernmental Coordination – There has been very little coordination (in other words, none) regarding the forecast used to develop the new state RTP.

Policy 3.0 Urban Form – Does the new plan facilitate or hurt implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. Has mobility and accessibility improved or decreased? Where is the data that backs up the findings?

Policy 7.0 Natural Environment – Is this effort consistent with Metro's goal 5 efforts. If so, why?

Policy 13.0 Regional Motor Vehicle System – “e” says that the plan will maintain an acceptable level of service on the regional motor vehicle system during peak and off-peak periods of demand, as defined in table. 1.2. So, where is the analysis that backs this up? Is it based on a forecast that has had sufficient intergovernmental coordination?

Policy 14.3 So how do the transit travel times measure up in this new plan? Where is the data to evaluate this Policy?

Policy 16.1 Does the bike mode share go up or down in this plan?

Policy 17.1 Does the pedestrian mode share go up or down in this plan?

Chapter 2 of the RTP – This entire 18 page chapter needs to be re-written to reflect the new forecast.

Chapter 3 – Much of this Chapter needs to be re-written to reflect the new forecast.

Chapter 4 – Will this Chapter be redone to reflect the new revenue forecasts?

Chapter 5 – Much of this Chapter needs to be re-written given the new forecast. The current RTP contains some excellent colored project maps. Is there a budget to reprint and redistribute a new RTP with new maps? We believe a broad redistribution is critical for broad acceptance, understanding and use.

Conclusion

We applaud Metro staff's efforts to pull together a financially constrained RTP that meets federal requirements. Given the timelines, we appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into this effort. However, at this time, we see no good reason to adopt (and a vast array of reasons not to adopt) an RTP update that attempts to meet the Transportation Planning Rule and other State requirements.

Instead, we urge that TPAC recommend the following to JPACT:

- *Proceed with adoption of the federal RTP*

- *At this time, do not adopt a revised RTP that attempts to meet the Transportation Planning Rule and other state land use requirements.*
- *Direct Metro staff to establish a work program for undertaking a comprehensive update of the RTP. The initial task in this effort would be the development of a coordinated, thoroughly reviewed 2025 forecast.*

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Andy Back
Principal Planner



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

November 24, 2003

Brian Newman, Councilor
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Brian:

I am writing to follow up on our recent conversation about the need for a pedestrian bridge across the Willamette River near Lake Oswego. Adding facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians to the existing railroad bridge would appear to be the most efficient way of accomplishing this.

There is currently no pedestrian crossing of the Willamette between Oregon City and the Sellwood Bridge in Southeast Portland. The addition of a bridge for bicyclists and pedestrians at this location will do a great deal to improve connectivity for the entire region, and could eventually facilitate a connection all the way to the coast.

I will look forward to working with you on this proposal in the future.

If you have any questions about this, please feel free to contact me or our Community Development Director, Stephan Lashbrook.

Sincerely,

Douglas J. Schmitz, City Manager

C: Mayor Hammerstad and City Council
Metro Council
Mike Jordan, Metro Administrative Officer
Jane Heisler, Assistant to the City Manager
Stephan Lashbrook, Community Dev. Director

Marilyn Matteson - RTP update public comments

F : Brad & Katrina Halverson <halverbk@att.net>
To: <trans@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: 11/25/2003 10:20 PM
Subject: RTP update public comments
CC: <halverbk@att.net>

Hello,

I would like to submit the following comments for the update of Metro's RTP:

Policy update: Figure 1.17: Regional Freight System Map - I believe that N Greeley Ave between N Interstate Ave and N Going St was upgraded from a minor truck route to a major truck route during the City's last TSP update.

Project update: #1135 - Frequent Bus service for Line 6 - MLK - this is included as part of TriMet's proposed service plan for 5/1/04 and beyond.

#1138 - Frequent Bus service for Line 75 - 39th/Lombard - this is included as part of TriMet's proposed service plan for 5/1/04 and beyond.

#4001 - Frequent Bus service for Line 72 - Killingsworth - this is included as part of TriMet's proposed service plan for 5/1/04 and beyond.

#1146 - Greeley Bikeway - construction is underway but not yet completed

I have not confirmed these discrepancies with the City of Portland or TriMet so I request that you do so. Please accept my apologies if I am in error.

I would appreciate a response regarding my questions if possible.

Sincerely,
 Brad Halverson
 4227 N Court Ave
 Portland, OR 97217-3407
 503.282.2755
 halverbk@att.net



METRO

November 25, 2003

Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC)
c/o Metro Planning Department
600 N.E. Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

Dear TPAC Members

Subject: Periodic Update of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

We are requesting that the following five projects be added to the RTP's "Financially Constrained List." The trails are on the Metro Council approved Regional Trails System Plan and Map, and the RTP. These are trail projects that Metro Parks and Greenspaces and local partners are working on together. Four of the five the trail projects are complementary to Metro's 2040 Plan and Centers objectives, and lie within one-mile of Regional Centers and/or Town Centers.

Project:

Sullivan's Gulch / Banfield Trail Feasibility Study (Regional Trail #37). This trail which would be on the north side of the freeway would connect the Eastbank Esplanade Trail to the I-205 Bike and Pedestrian Trail. The Central City, Lloyd District Regional Center, Hollywood Town Center and Gateway Regional Center would all be connected by the future trail. Inter-modal transportation connections at LRT stations, particularly the Gateway Transit Center.

Cost:

\$150,000.

Partners:

Portland Parks, Portland Department of Transportation, Portland Development Commission, Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association, PSU Urban Studies and Engineering departments

Project:

Springwater to Trolley Trail Connection (Regional Trail #30). Plan, design and construct sidewalks on S.E. 17th Ave. between the two trails. Bike lanes currently exist on the street. The project will connect the Springwater Corridor and Three Bridges project to the Milwaukie Town Center and Trolley Trail. The proposed project is within one-mile of downtown Milwaukie.

Cost:

Preliminary Engineering and Design cost of \$200,000. Implementation costs will be determined during the PE phase.

Partners:

City of Milwaukie, City of Portland, Sellwood Moreland Improvement League (SMILE), Friends of the Trolley Trail

Project:

Mt. Scott Creek Trail (Regional Trail #48). Feasibility study and cost of trail design and construction, including an under-crossing for the trail at S.E. Sunnyside Rd. Regional trail just east of the Clackamas Regional Center. The trail would connect Happy Valley to Mt. Talbert.

Cost:

Feasibility Study cost of \$75,000. \$692,000 for ROW Acquisition, Design, Preliminary Engineering and Construction of the trail

Partners:

City of Happy Valley

Project:

Phillips Creek Trail (Regional Trail #32) Trail loop around Clackamas Regional Center, connecting to I-205 Bike / Pedestrian Trail and the North Clackamas Greenway Trail, following Phillips Creek. Funds needed for trail studies, design, preliminary engineering, and construction.

Cost:

Feasibility Study cost of \$100,000. The study will estimate costs for right of way acquisition, preliminary engineering and construction of the trail.

Partners:

Clackamas County

Project:

Columbia Slough Trail (Regional Trail #45). Completion of trail from Kelley Point Park east to Blue Lake Regional Park. Funds needed for acquisition of rights of way and easements; trail design, preliminary engineering and construction.

Cost:

Feasibility Study cost of \$150,000. Implementation costs to be estimated following the completion of the study.


Partners:

City of Portland Parks, Portland Bureau of Environmental Services, Portland Development Commission, Port of Portland, Columbia Slough Watershed Group

If you have any questions or need more information on these proposed additions to the "Financially Constrained" List in the RTP, please contact: Mel Huie, Regional Trails Coordinator at (503) 797-1731 or Heather Nelson Kent, Planning and Education Manager at (503) 797-1739.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Jim Desmond, Director
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 25, 2003
To: Kim Ellis, Metro
From: Robin Katz
Re: Port's Comments on 2004 RTP Project Update (October 31, 2003)

The following comments are in response to the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan Project Update (October 31, 2003), Section 2. The numbers refer to projects.

2070 - add

The new 2070 is distinct from the old project, which was ODOT's "Widen I-205 SB on-ramp at Airport Way" for \$10 million (preferred system) in 2016-2025.

4019 - delete

There is no plan for another LRT station in PIC or for realigning track there. New 4060 is the correct LRT realignment project - to occur with future PDX terminal expansion east.

4029 - change

This project should occur in 2004-09.

4030 - change

This project is in the Columbia Corridor, not PDX IA.

4037 and 4015 - combine

These projects should be combined per direction from the City of Portland.

4038 - change

The project cost is \$790,000.

4045 - change

This project should occur in 2004-09.

4060 - change

This project should occur in 2010-15.

4085 - change

The project cost is \$350,000.

4086 - change

This project should occur in 2004-09.

11/26/03

To: Metro's Transportation Plan

From: Victoria Green, chair, Hayden Island Neighborhood Network (HiNoon)

To whom it may concern,

I have many concerns about your plans for Hayden Island. These include a railroad switching yard, and a bridge to the island from Marine Drive.

I join all of the North Portland neighborhood chairs in expressing my frustration with the I-5 Trade Corridor Study and their findings that would expand the existing lanes, and urge traffic to use I-205.

We want the bridge to go all the way across the Columbia River, and not stop at Hayden Island. We believe your plan would create a traffic nightmare, especially during the busy holiday shopping season at Jantzen Beach Mall.

Please read the enclosed letter from all the North Portland neighborhoods, who join the entire Columbia Blvd. business corridor, and the Ports of Vancouver and Portland.

We would like a reply back.

Thanks so much,



Victoria Green,

Chair, HiNoon

539 N. Hayden Bay Dr.

Portland OR 97217

Vancouver BNSF Rail Bridge Project

From: Ad-Hoc Steering Committee for the Vancouver Rail Bridge Upgrade Project:

Co-Chair Jerry Grossnickle
 Chair, Bridge Committee
 Columbia River Towboat
 Association (CRTA)
 Phone: 503-289-3046

Co-Chair Ginger Metcalf
 Executive Director
 Identity Clark County
 Phone: 360-695-4116

To: TPAC
 November 26, 2003 Meeting

The Project Name & Description:

The Vancouver Rail Bridge Project is to replace the existing "swing span" with a "lift span" and place it closer to the middle of the river.

Estimated cost:

The Coast Guard estimated the cost at \$42 million.

Fund Source:

Highway Trust Funds (Bridge Discretionary Fund), as a Demonstration Project.

We are seeking funding from sources that are separate from the funding sources used to forecast the financially constrained RTP.

We hope to arrive at a funding strategy that does not negatively impact the JPACT "financially constrained system" funding forecasts, yet remains within JPACT's priority recommendations. Thus we will likely seek Highway Trust Funds through the Bridge Discretionary Fund and as a Demonstration Project for a nationally significant freight corridor, where we resolve difficult freight mobility and safety problems at an important multi-modal intersection of that corridor.

Jerry Grossnickle (503-289-3046)
Chair, Bridge Committee, Columbia River Towboat Association

Vancouver BNSF Rail Bridge Project

From: Ad-Hoc Steering Committee for the Vancouver Rail Bridge Upgrade Project:

Co-Chair Jerry Grossnickle
 Chair, Bridge Committee
 Columbia River Towboat
 Association (CRTA)
 Phone: 503-289-3046

Co-Chair Ginger Metcalf
 Executive Director
 Identity Clark County
 Phone: 360-695-4116

To: Bi-State Committee on Transportation
 October 23, 2003 Meeting

The Request

We are asking the Bi-State Committee to recommend to JPACT and to the S.W. Washington RTC that the Vancouver Rail Bridge Project be included in the Financially Constrained System as a priority of the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Project

The project is to replace the existing "swing span" with a "lift span" and place it closer to the middle of the river.

The Problem

1. **Opening Too Narrow.** The current opening is too narrow. At less than 200 feet wide, it was built (in 1908) to handle much smaller paddlewheel-type freight vessels; today's tows are often over 600 feet long and over 80 feet wide. It there is current, wind or fog, passage can be very difficult.
2. **Too Close to I-5.** The navigational difficulties for downbound tows are compounded by the nearby I-5 bridge. The distance between the bridges is barely adequate to allow the difficult maneuvers required to safely negotiate the bridge openings. Although the rail bridge opening is reasonably well lined up with the I-5 lifts (both are near the Washington shore), captains do not call for these lifts when they can be avoided, nor are they allowed to use them during the peak traffic periods of morning and evening "rush hour" (6:30-9 AM and 2:30-6PM). So they usually navigate under the I-5 bridges' higher spans toward the middle of the river, which require tows to make a difficult "S" turn to line up with the narrow rail bridge opening. This maneuver becomes more dangerous as river levels rise and currents increase. When the river reaches 6 feet at the Vancouver gauge, the maneuver (through the high span) becomes too dangerous, and captains use the I-5 lifts. In years of high

3. **Increasing Danger.** The dangers to tug & barge tows from a miscalculated maneuver are obvious and immediate, with the possibilities for loss of life and property a constant consideration for towboat captains. With increasing I-5 traffic, there has been increased pressure on captains to avoid using the lifts, and in 1999 the Coast Guard extended the length of rush-hour closures of the lifts. Thus the danger of a miscalculation has steadily increased. If a tow were to hit and disable the rail bridge (the closest alternative is east of The Dalles, at Wishram), the cost to the regional economy could be enormous.

The Benefits of a Relocated Lift Span

1. **Ease Navigation.** If a rail bridge lift span is placed nearer the middle of the river, towboat captains will be able to use the higher spans of the I-5 without making the dangerous "S" turns to line up with the opening.
2. **Wider Opening.** The lift span would be about 300 feet wide if it were placed on current pier structures, making it a much safer opening for marine traffic.
3. **Faster Opening.** A lift opening could be made considerably faster than the present swing opening, resulting in less disruption to rail traffic.
4. **Avoid I-5 Lifts.** A lift opening placed more toward the middle of the river would allow marine traffic to nearly always avoid using the I-5 lifts. WSDOT calculated that the current average annual cost of lifts in I-5 traffic delay is about \$0.8 million and will steadily increase to a projected cost of \$12 million by 2021. Currently a lift causes about 20 minutes in midday traffic delay, but by 2021 the midday delay could exceed 90 minutes.
5. **Part of Existing Plan.** The project is part of an existing regional plan for improving I-5 freight and traffic mobility, for it is included in the Final Recommendations of the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership Strategic Plan. Although the Partnership study focused on the highway traffic problems of the I-5 corridor, it concluded that a modification of the rail bridge would have important positive impacts on traffic and freight mobility within the I-5 corridor.
6. **Planning for New I-5 Bridge.** The proposal would permit planners of a new I-5 crossing much greater flexibility, for the lifts at the north end of the bridge could be eliminated. This would result in lower construction costs and would

eliminate a large annual budget currently allocated to lift operations and maintenance. Removal of the lift towers would also increase safety for aircraft using the nearby Pearson airfield.

Bi-State Committee

October 23, 2003

Page 3

7. **A Third Track.** A new lift could be designed that would be able to accommodate a third track, if and when a third track is added to the bridge.

Cost

Truman-Hobbs officials assumed the project would cost about \$42 million. This assumption was based on an unrelated study by SW Washington RTC for adding a third track to the bridge, and was considered relevant because it also contemplated adding a lift. However, the figure must be considered an educated guess; rather than resulting from an actual cost analysis. (Contact Bill Burgel [503-423-3728] at HDR Engineering, for information.)

Funding Considerations

1. **Truman-Hobbs.** The CRTA initiated a "Truman-Hobbs" proceeding in 1999 to have the Coast Guard declare the rail bridge an "unreasonable hazard to navigation," thereby making it eligible for a federally funded modification under the Truman-Hobbs Act. In early 2003, the Coast Guard finally decided that the project did not meet the cost/benefit requirements of its regulations, partly because the bridge has not been hit often enough, and partly because the benefits to I-5 traffic could not be considered. The Coast Guard was also prevented by its regulations from considering the increasing danger of future accidents (which are inevitable, according to towboat captains' testimony) because of I-5 lift restrictions. Nor could the Coast Guard consider the massive disruption to freight movement that is likely to result from a major incident at the bridge, or the national security implications of such a disruption.
2. **Falling Through the Cracks - The Funding Conundrum.** The rail bridge project is truly multi-modal. It has significant benefits for marine safety as well as for highway traffic and freight mobility, and it also provides some benefits to rail from a faster opening (and even a potential benefit to air traffic safety at Pearson). But with the failure of Truman-Hobbs, there appears to be no single agency, federal or state, with the ability to take on the project and provide the funding. The bridge is private property, after all, and is not within the traditional jurisdiction of any highway department (even though they are now called transportation departments), and although the railroad owner is subject to the oversight of the Federal Railroad Administration, the FRA has

no legal ability to order a rail improvement for the primary benefit of marine and highway traffic. The Coast Guard has the legal ability to order a rail bridge improvement for the benefit of marine safety, but cannot use highway benefits in making its cost/benefit analysis to justify such an order.

Bi-State Committee

October 23, 2003

Page 4

3. **The Solution – Congressionally Mandated Truman-Hobbs.** However, Congress can declare on its own that the bridge is an unreasonable hazard to navigation, and it can direct the Coast Guard to apply Truman-Hobbs procedures. This has been done for other bridge projects. Thus, the Coast Guard would conduct the engineering study, do the EIS, and contract the entire project from beginning to end. The Coast Guard's Truman-Hobbs director at headquarters has indicated that their Congressional liaison office will work with our Congressional representatives to properly craft the necessary legislation. However, considering the benefits to I-5 traffic (as well as benefits to Amtrak and other federally supported rail projects from the new lift), funding would come from sources other than Truman-Hobbs, for which it technically does not qualify and which currently lacks sufficient funding in any event.
4. **SAFETEA** is the funding vehicle we would like to target to provide federal dollars for the project. To achieve funding under SAFETEA, we seek the support of the various transportation committees in both states, particularly the Bi-State Committee, JPACT and the SW Washington RTC.


Project Support

In addition to support from the maritime community (CRTA, Columbia River Pilots, Port of Vancouver, Port of Portland, Pacific Northwest Waterways Association) and the Vancouver business community (Identity Clark County), the project received official support at the Truman-Hobbs hearing from the following:

Senators Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Gordon Smith and Ron Wyden
Representatives Brian Baird, Earl Blumenauer, Peter Defazio, Darlene Hooley, Greg Walden and David Wu

WSDOT, ODOT, City of Portland, Metro

We expect support from these and others in our effort to seek funding for the project under a modified Truman-Hobbs approach, and have begun discussions with Congressional staffs about crafting the appropriate legislation.



North Portland Neighborhood Services

2209 N. Schofield Portland Oregon 97217

503.823.4524 503.285.7843 fax

npno123@teleport.com

Arbor Lodge Bridgeton Cathedral Park East Columbia Kenton Hayden Island Overlook Piedmont Portsmouth St Johns University Park

November 28, 2003

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

Dear Councilor Burkholder:

As Chair of the Hayden Island Neighborhood Network, I have been authorized to write on behalf of the North Portland Neighborhood Associations.

Over the past year, the Bi-State I-5 Partnership has been pursuing options to alleviate traffic congestion on the I-5 Corridor. The group's suggestion is to widen the existing bridge.

The North Portland Neighborhood Associations think that just adding capacity to the existing Interstate Bridge does not solve the immediate or future needs of the greater regional area. Increasing capacity on I-5 burdens the communities along the corridor, and does not solve our congestion problem. Also, as safety becomes more of a concern to all types of commerce and freight movements, just widening I-5 leaves us in a very unstable situation.

By putting another bridge across the Columbia River from Marine Drive at Portland Road to the Port of Vancouver we can help remove heavy freight congestion off the I-5 Corridor and direct it to where it needs to go – fast, efficiently and safely.

As economies move to a more "deliver on order" commerce, we must be able to transit freight quickly. Global market growth in the container business is anticipated to have container volumes doubling or tripling over the next decade. In reviewing the broader themes, it is apparent that freight has unique characteristics when compared to passenger traffic. But the improvement of freight productivity warrants examining the linkages between both the main system miles and freight facilities. * The current National Highway System International Connectors Infrastructures constraints are:

- Poor physical conditions
- Orphan status
- Inadequate coordination of investment strategies

****The Portland Development Commission agrees, saying the lack of inter-modal freight connections is the number one constraint to business investment in Portland after fears about the Superfund designation.**

By building freight priority passageways we can alleviate congestion and risk while improving commerce and freight movement through the industrial areas and ports, both northern Oregon and southern Washington. This is what the I-5 Trade Corridor Study was created to do.

November 28, 2003

Page 2

The North Portland Neighborhood Associations join the Columbia Corridor Business Association, the Pacific NW International Trade Association, and the Ports of Vancouver and Portland in recommending inclusion of study of a west side arterial bridge over the Columbia River between the Ports in the I-5 Trade Corridor Study.

Sincerely,


Victoria Green

Chair, Hayden Island Neighborhood Network

On behalf of: Arbor Lodge, Bridgeton, Cathedral Park, East Columbia, Kenton, Hayden Island, Overlook, Piedmont, Portsmouth, St. Johns and University Park Neighborhood Associations

* Federal Dept. of Transportation, www.fhwa.dot.gov

**PDC, Summer 2003



MEMORANDUM

*Transportation Planning
Community and Economic Development Department
City of Gresham*

December 2, 2003

TO: Kim Ellis, Metro
FROM: Ron Papsdorf, Principal Transportation Planner
RE: 2004 RTP Update

In reviewing the October 31, 2003 public review materials for the Regional Transportation Plan update, it appears that a few of the project changes for Gresham are not properly reflected. These changes were included in the East Multnomah County submittal of October 20. That original submittal is attached for reference. The projects that need to be corrected are:

2047 - Division Boulevard - project limits and cost
2027 - Civic Neighborhood LRT Station/Plaza - cost
2014 - Glisan Street Bikeway - project limits and cost
2057 - Gresham RC Pedestrian Improvements - cost
new - MAX Path, Ruby Junction to Cleveland Station (\$2m)
2048 - Burnside Blvd, Wallula to Hogan - add to FC system
2028 - Powell Blvd - cost

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further information.

December 2, 2003

Metro Council

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

SUBJECT: Metro Council Public Hearing on RTP Update

I am pleased to write this letter in support of the placement of the Sullivan's Gulch / I-84 Trail Feasibility Study on the RTP's "Financially Constrained" list.

Along with one of our graduate students in urban studies and planning, I have had the pleasure of meeting with staff from Metro Parks and Greenspaces and the City of Portland to develop a scope for a short-term class project for civil & environmental engineering undergraduate students at Portland State University. We are looking forward to connecting our students' educational experience with a real world project led by Metro and the City. We hope that in some small way our students' analysis can contribute to the overall success of the Feasibility Study.

The PSU Center for Transportation Studies is pleased to be working with Metro and other agency partners on this and other important projects in our region. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 503-725-4249 if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,



Robert L. Bertini, Ph.D., P.E.

Director

Center for Transportation Studies



PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

9325 N. Van Houten / Portland, Oregon 97203

Phone: (503) 916-6260 • FAX: (503) 916-2619

CLARENDON SCHOOL

Office of the Principal

December 2, 2003

Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Metro:


Clarendon Elementary is located two blocks south of Columbia Boulevard and two blocks west of Portsmouth Boulevard.

We are concerned with the shifting of non-local truck traffic from Lombard to Columbia Blvd. We know that Lombard had one of the highest fatality rates in the state, and we worry that this shift will increase the danger to our children crossing Columbia Blvd. to get to our school.

The problem is that we do have a light to help us cross at Portsmouth and Columbia Blvd., but it is located at the top of a hill and is on a blind curve coming from the east. We would like to ensure that our children's crossing is appropriately labeled with school crossing signs, that trucks are aware of the need to stop at our stop signs and lights and that they watch for children, especially before, during and after school hours.

We see that your plan calls for education and enforcement of existing regulations and a truck-signing program. We think that it is important for you to follow through on these promises to keep our children safe.

Sincerely,



Antonio Lopez
Principal



Sylvia Evans
PTA President

and the School Site Council

nll

Subject: RTP freight routes

Date: Wednesday, December 3, 2003 2:26 PM

From: Weinman, Ron <ronw@co.clackamas.or.us>

To: 'Kim Ellis' ellisk@metro.dst.or.us

Cc: "Skidmore, Ron" ronsk@co.clackamas.or.us

Kim,
Clackamas County is recommending that McLoughlin Blvd be changed as follows

* Mc Loughlin Blvd. (Hwy 224 to I-205 south ramps) - Clackamas
County/Milwaukie/Gladstone

ACTION - Change the "Main Roadway Route" designation to "No
Designation" "Road Connectors"

The reasons for these recommendations are

1. The route is one of the main routes between Oregon City, Gladstone and Milwaukie.
2. There are industrial properties throughout the Corridor with the largest being an area near Roethe Road of about 80 acres.
3. The area adjacent to McLoughlin is a major destination for freight. It serves everything from industrial to retail including a major auto sales area.
4. McLoughlin Blvd would be an alternative for traffic including freight when Highway-224 and I-205 is closed or congested do to incidents on this route.

My suggest is to leave the designation as is and plan on reviewing the classification as part of the major update that is expected to start within the next year. As mentioned, if a change is necessary I would recommend that McLoughlin Blvd be down graded to a Road connector.



PORTLAND

OFFICE OF

TRANSPORTATION

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
(503) 823-5185
FAX (503) 823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD (503) 823-6868

Williams
Director

December 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kloster, Kim Ellis - Metro
From: Laurel Wentworth, Chief Transportation Planner
Subject: Recommendation on the draft 2004 RTP Update

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to the RTP. Other memos from PDOT address technical changes to classifications and projects. This memo raises the question of whether proceeding with the more significant proposed changes to the RTP are wise at this time. We share Washington County's concerns that this is too much change in a very constrained timeframe without adequate opportunity for review and comment. While not ideal, adopting an interim RTP for federal air quality purposes may better serve Metro and local jurisdictional needs at this time.

The points in support of this position are summarized below:

1. The RTP update references a new 2025 population and employment forecast (Page 6-13, Technical Update) that has not been evaluated by local jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions are required to use this forecast for purposes of TSP updates, including planning studies that amend TSPs. Making the change noted could be seen as a level of acceptance for a forecast that does not yet exist and could cause confusion for current planning projects.
2. Dropping the Priority System at this time is not a minor change. Portland has been using the Priority System for planning purposes since the adoption of the RTP. As noted on Page 6-58, Technical Update (New Section 6.8.15), moving to either the Financially Constrained or Preferred System for planning purposes can lead to significant underestimating or overestimating the available transportation system over the next 20 years. Moving to either system for planning purposes needs to be addressed, as the commentary in section 6.8.15 says, "in detail to ensure a balance between allowing desired development and preventing land use actions that outstrip the public ability to provide transportation infrastructure."
3. Making the changes proposed would require complete or partial rewrites of several RTP chapters - particularly Chapter 5, Growth and the Priority System. It will be very confusing to not have the entire RTP updated and reprinted to be consistent with the significant changes noted above.

While we appreciate the effort that staff has made to produce a financially constrained RTP that meets federal requirements, it is premature to adopt RTP amendments that will result in such significant changes at this time.

We urge TPAC to recommend the following to JPACT:

- Complete an RTP that will meet federal requirements
- Do not adopt changes to the RTP that include dropping the Strategic System in favor of Financially Constrained and Preferred Systems.
- Direct Metro staff to establish a work program that will provide for a comprehensive update of the RTP.

CC: John Gillam, Jeanne Harrison



CITY OF
PORTLAND
OFFICE OF
TRANSPORTATION

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
(503) 823-5185
FAX (503) 823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD (503) 823-6868

Brant Williams
Director

December 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kloster, Kim Ellis - Metro
From: Deena Platman, Transportation Planning
CC: Laurel Wentworth, John Gillam
Subject: Requested changes to the draft 2004 RTP Policy and Project Update

After further review I have a few additional changes to the draft documents.

1 - Policy Update

- Add N Greeley Avenue between N Interstate Avenue and N Going Street as a Road Connector on the Regional Freight System map. Portland's TSP identifies Greeley as a Major Truck Street located in a Freight District.
- Delete the Gateway Regional Center from section 6.7.7 Areas of Special Concern. Portland's TSP has addressed this area in accordance with the Transportation Planning Rule. Delete or revise Figure 1.13b Gateway Regional Center – Special Area of Concern to reflect its current status.

2 – Project Update

- Add a new project to the Financially Constrained System:

Project Name: Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe Multimodal Improvements

Segment: St Louis - Philadelphia

Description: Implement signal and pedestrian crossing improvements to improve pedestrian safety and freight flow.

Estimated Cost: \$1.1 million

Timing: 2004 – 2009

Jurisdiction: PDOT

This project implements a portion of the St Johns pedestrian district improvements (#1150). This phase was selected for MTIP funding and should be identified as a stand-alone project in the RTP.

- # 1095 - Union Station Multi-modal Center Study, move project to Financially Constrained System and update cost estimate to \$300,000. This project is a priority for the City of Portland; submitted in the most recent MTIP process and likely to be resubmitted for MTIP funding in the future.

Eileen Argentina
System Management

Don Gardner
Engineering & Development

Jeanne Nyquist
Maintenance

Richard Steinbrugge
Finance

Laurel Wentworth
Planning



CITY OF
PORTLAND
OFFICE OF
TRANSPORTATION

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
(503) 823-5185
FAX (503) 823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD (503) 823-6868

**Brant
Williams**
Director

December 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kloster, Kim Ellis - Metro
From: John Gillam, Transportation Planning Division
CC: Laurel Wentworth, Deena Platman, Jeanne Harrison
Subject: Requested Changes to the draft 2004 RTP Project Update

Upon further review of the draft (10/31/03) 2004 RTP Project List we have a few additional requested changes to this document.

Project Updates

Add the following projects to the Financially Constrained System:

1. Project #1173, Hillsdale TC Pedestrian Improvements.

Project Name: Retain same name.

Project Location: Retain same location.

Description: Retain same project description.

Estimated Cost: Retain same project cost.

Program Year: 2010-2015

Jurisdiction: Retain as Portland

Pedestrian and street network improvements for a Town Center warrant inclusion in the Financially Constrained System. This project is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe.

2. Project #1096, Barbur/I-5 Corridor Study.

Project Name: Retain same name.

Project Location: Retain same location.

Description: Retain same project description.

Estimated Cost: Retain same project cost.

Program Year: 2004-2009

Jurisdiction: Retain as Portland

This study is part of the Metro Corridor Initiatives Planning Program and its completion and recommendations will provide improved project definitions for several RTP projects in the vicinity of the Barbur Boulevard/I-5 Corridor. This project is identified in the Refinement Plans and Studies Chapter of the Portland TSP.

**Eileen
Argentina**
System
Management

**Don
Gardner**
Engineering &
Development

**Jeanne
Nyquist**
Maintenance

**Richard
Steinbrugge**
Finance

**Laurel
Wentworth**
Planning

3. New Project for the Capitol Hwy/Vermont/30th Ave. Intersection.

Project Name: Capitol Hwy/Vermont Intersection Improvements

Project Location: Capitol Hwy/Vermont/30th Ave. Intersection

Description: Provide traffic safety and pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements at this intersection and approaching street segments.

Estimated Cost: \$450,000

Program Year: 2010-2015

Jurisdiction: Portland

This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. It was not built as part of the initial street project improvements due to budget limitations. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe.

Add the following project to the Preferred System:

1. New Project for Capitol Hwy. between Sunset and Barbur

Project Name: SW Capitol Highway - Terwilliger Segment.

Project Location: Capitol Hwy.: Sunset - Barbur

Description: Provide pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements.

Estimated Cost: \$910,000

Program Year: 2010-2015

Jurisdiction: Portland

This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. Portions of this project segment are rated as higher priority improvements. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe.

2. New Project for Capitol Hwy. between Huber and Stephenson

Project Name: SW Capitol Highway – Marquam Segment.

Project Location: Capitol Hwy.: Huber- Stephenson

Description: Provide improved pedestrian crossings and median design treatments.

Estimated Cost: \$750,000

Program Year: 2016-2026

Jurisdiction: Portland

This project is identified as part of the Capitol Highway Plan adopted by City Council. This project is on the regional system and is identified in the Portland TSP as a mid-term timeframe.

Delete the following projects from the Financially Constrained System, add to the Preferred System:

1. Project #2024, Gateway RC Pedestrian District Improvements – Phase III.

Retain all other current project information.

This is the last of a three phase implementation schedule of local street network development in the regional center. The first and second phase of this project should remain as is in the Financially Constrained System.



**Brant
Williams**
Director

**Eileen
Argentina**
System
Management

**Don
Gardner**
Engineering &
Development

**Jeanne
Nyquist**
Maintenance

**Richard
Steinbrugge**
Finance

**Laurel
Wentworth**
Planning

CITY OF
PORTLAND
OFFICE OF
TRANSPORTATION

Jim Francesconi, Commissioner
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204-1914
(503) 823-5185
FAX (503) 823-7576 or 823-7371
TDD (503) 823-6868

December 3, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Kloster, Kim Ellis - Metro
From: John Gillam, Transportation Planning Division
CC: Laurel Wentworth, Deena Platman, Jeanne Harrison
Subject: Allocation Adjustments for Requested Changes
to the draft 2004 RTP Project Update

The following provides a summary of allocation adjustments to the Financially Constrained System resulting from our requested project list changes through memos of December 3 from Deena Platman and myself.

Projects added to the Financially Constrained System

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Project #1173, Hillsdale TC Pedestrian Improvements | \$3,465 000 |
| Project #1096, Barbur/I-5 Corridor Study | \$1,732,000 |
| New Project, Capitol Hwy/Vermont/30 th Ave. Intersection | \$ 450,000 |
| New Project, Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe Multi-Modal Imps. | \$1,100,000 |
| Project #1095, Union Station/Multi-Modal Center Study | \$ 300,000 |
| Subtotal | \$7,047,000 |

Projects deleted from the Financially Constrained System*

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Project #2024, Gateway RC Ped. District Imps. – Phase III | \$6,930,000 |
|---|-------------|

* Project is added to the Preferred System

As you can see, our adjustments place our requests within \$117,000 of balance. This should be within acceptable estimate range at this level of detail. But if these figures need to exactly balance, then reduce Project #1173 by this amount. Please call me if you have any questions.

From: "Chris Smith" <chrissm@easystreet.com>
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 14:45:57 -0800
To: "Tom Kloster" <klostert@metro.dst.or.us>
Cc: "Michael Harrison" <mike.harrison@ci.portland.or.us>
Subject: FW: [wnwdiscussion] FW: Wake Up SW Portland our Transportation \$ are being stolen

Tom,

Can you please enter this into the public comment record for the RTP?

Thanks.

Chris

-----Original Message-----

From: Anne Dufay [<mailto:anne@nwnw.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 1:25 PM
To: 'wnwdiscussion'
Subject: [wnwdiscussion] FW: Wake Up SW Portland our Transportation \$ are being stolen

-----Original Message-----

From: Don Baack [<mailto:baack@pacifier.com>]

Greater SW Portland is going to be the loser in the latest changes to The Regional Transportation Plans if commissioner Jim Francesconi and the Portland Department of Transportation, PDOT, have their way. Guess what, a huge slush fund, \$80,375,000, for yet to be designed projects associated with the Tram and North MacAdam development will be the winner. The Tram is slated to get \$15 million, and changes to the west end of the Ross Island Bridge are slated to get over \$25 million from the scarce funds that will be spent in the immediate future. That will just be the beginning, notice how the tram costs have doubled in the past month? Is this huge slush fund going to pay for the tram cost over runs?

To pay for the largess in the North MacAdam to encourage development, we are asked to forgo improvements planned long ago and patiently awaiting funding.

The net effect on SW Portland will be a longer wait to get through the light on Barbur at Sheridan just south of I-405, we now must wait for 5 light cycles at the 5-6 pm rush hour, a two lane Front Avenue (Naito Parkway) which will force more traffic onto Barbur, and adversely affect our ability to get downtown to Oldtown, to the Ross Island Bridge and to NE Portland via the Steel Bridge. What will Barbur Blvd be like in this area when Front becomes constricted? We will wait even more signal cycles at Sheridan, we will still walk in the mud along Capitol Highway or worse, not be able to safely walk or bike along Capitol Highway at all. We will not be able to walk along Barbur Blvd for lack of sidewalks. We will not have signals at intersections which are very difficult to negotiate.

How is this grand theft of our transportation dollars happening? PDOT and Metro are in the process of a quick, stealth (there has been no City of Portland public comment opportunity, just a tiny postcard early in October, and the Portland City Council has not approved the changes) updating the Regional Transportation Plan, RTP. The RTP specifies which projects will be funded with federal transportation dollars in the next and subsequent rounds. To get considered in the next 5 years, your project must be on the preferred or financially constrained list. Everything else is eyewash.

I want to explain why I call the Barbur Streetscape Project the silk purse for a sow's ear project. In 1997 and 1998 the Oregon Department of Transportation Department, ODOT, was preparing to resurface Barbur Blvd. ODOT was preparing to address a number of sidewalk and bike lane deficiencies but did not want to install street trees as was required by City of Portland standards. A number of folks in SW Portland objected. The net result was an agreement between the citizens of SW Portland and Charlie Hales, at that time the Commissioner of Transportation, that an urgent study would be done for the bike and pedestrian needs of the entire length of Barbur Blvd, and that funding would follow on a priority basis. The study was completed within 6 months. To date, Tri-Met has funded and built just one small pedestrian crossing. 3 additional pedestrian crossings have been promised.

Until now the funding for the project, 4,620,000 has been on the preferred list. Now it is being dumped into the ignore category and we can put up with no sidewalks, interrupted and dangerous bike lanes for at least 10 years. Really makes you want to trust your government doesn't it.

You will be interested to know that just 2 capital projects have been built in SW Portland in the last 2 or 3 years with a total cost of under \$800,000.

What can we do? We can testify at the 2pm Metro Council hearing on December 4th about our objections to these changes. Ask them to put the following projects on the financially constrained list: 2 Capitol Highway Plan projects, Hoot Owl Corner and Sunset to Terwilliger, the section from Multnomah to Taylor's Ferry is already on that list. Ask them to keep the promises made on Barbur in 1998 and put the entire 4.6 million Barbur Streetscape Project back on the financially constrained list, ask that the signals at SW Multnomah Blvd and Garden Home, SW 62nd and Taylors Ferry, SW Vermont and Capitol Highway at SW 25th, and the bike and ped improvements for BH Highway be on the financially constrained list. Ask that 5 million in funding for the pedestrian crossing of I-5 associated with the tram be broken out as a separate project so that the funds cannot be used for other purposes. Ask that the Newberry and Vermont Bridges on Barbur be put on the list for replacement in 5 years or so to assure the funds are available when these bridges must be replaced. (They underwent temporary repairs 5 years ago and were scheduled to last 10 years from that time.)

Ask that the total funds designated for the I-5, North MacAdam, Ross Island Bridge changes be reduced from the \$80,375,000, (projects 1025, 1027, 1030, 1087 and 1098) currently in the financially constrained budget. Ask that the projects be broken into a number of projects and a portion of them be removed from the financially constrained budget.

You can let Jim Francesconi and the rest of the Portland City Council know what you think of their transportation decisions and spending priorities. We are being screwed and I for one am tired of it. We need a more equitable distribution of transportation dollars. Here are a few facts:

Per the 1999 street inventory information I have: SW has 50.9 miles of substandard arterial street mileage, which represents 45% of the total substandard arterial street mileage in the entire City of Portland. Arterials are streets like Barbur, BH Highway, and Capitol Highway. SW has 144.7 miles of substandard local streets, 35% of the total substandard local streets in the City of Portland. The reason the arterials and streets are classified substandard is mostly due to not having sidewalks.

This is not going to change unless we decide to do something to change it. It will take each of us making our voice heard loud and clear. Join me in objecting to this theft.

Pass this on to your friends and neighbors. Speak up now.


Don Baack

Don Baack
6495 SW Burlingame Place
Portland, OR 97239-7001
503-246-2088
Baack@pacifier.com
SWTrails Web Site <http://explorepdx.com/swtrails.html>



Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc.

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



December 3, 2003

Metro Regional Center
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232

Our coalition of 16 neighborhoods serving Southwest Portland has reviewed the RTP as posted on your website. We have also coordinated our concerns with the Portland Bureau of Transportation planning staff.

- Southwest Portland is behind the rest of the metropolitan area regarding the transportation infrastructure serving the communities. Within Portland itself, 45% of the substandard arterials in the entire city are within Southwest Portland, even though it comprises only about 1/7th of the land area. Pedestrian facilities, so important to our school children and our transit system, as well to air quality and personal health, are almost non-existent, with only 15+/-% of the city streets having sidewalks. Priority funding to bring Southwest Portland up to the standard of the rest of the metropolitan area must be provided if progress is to be made to counteract this historic neglect. These improvements can be accomplished in accordance with the Portland Transportation System Plan (TSP) but only if both the City and Metro provide funding.
- Comprehensive project development concept plans have been carried for three major project areas during the past decade in Southwest Portland. These are for Capitol Highway, Barbur Boulevard Streetscape, and South Portland Circulation.
 - Capitol Highway Plan. This is the oldest of these priority plans. Project funding to complete this construction has not been incorporated into the funded portion of the RTP. Specifically, The Portland TSP 90029 and 90070 need to be given immediate funding priority within the RTP, and RTP# 1202 must be retained.
 - Barbur Boulevard Streetscape Plan. This 1999 project to create a series of safer pedestrian crossings as well as construct longitudinal sidewalks along this major trafficway was to have


commenced upon plan completion. It hasn't, with only one crossing constructed in 4 years. This project appears to be RTP# 1199. It should have been completed prior to the current reconstruction of I-5 through the corridor and the construction of the ITS system designed to handle the added traffic demands of this corridor, but these projects were funded while the community and personal safety needs were not. Recommend immediate full funding. Note that subsequent studies of this corridor are also being recommended in the RTP, but the value of these improvements will be unaffected the results of those studies.

- South Portland Circulation Plan. This plan is contained in the RTP as #1027, with full funding at \$28,293,000. This is better handled as a series of projects, with those elements adding to the transportation infrastructure, such as the pedestrian bridge over Interstate 5 and the safer access to the Ross Island Bridge receiving priority and funding during the life of this RTP, and the other elements moved to the priority classification.
- In addition to those projects contained within specific plans, we offer comment on the following projects in the Portland TSP or in your RTP.
 - We strongly support RTP# 1211, Garden Home Road, SW (Capitol Hwy-Multnomah and RTP# 1189, Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy at 62nd Ave pedestrian improvements and urge the construction of these in the immediate future. These intersections are extremely dangerous at this time.
 - We urge Metro to consider moving RTP#'s 1176 and 1177 to the 2004-2009 time frame.
 - The recently identified safety improvements (guardrails) to Boonesferry Road and Arnold Street need to be added to both the TSP and RTP.
 - RTP# 1181, "Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway ITS" needs to have its description clarified to "Capitol Highway/Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway ITS". The project location appears to start on Capitol Highway as it includes Terwilliger within the project description. The Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway does not intersect Terwilliger, and the project most likely incorporates the signal at Capitol Highway and Terwilliger. Further, any ITS improvements that project excess traffic must be accompanied by adequate pedestrian facilities when placed in an urban setting such as this. Accordingly, the cost of this project needs to be increased to include the construction of any missing sidewalk and street crossing sections.
 - Key projects for moving traffic through SW Portland have not been included within the 2025 RTP Financially constrained system. These projects would provide relief to the I-5/Barbur/South Portland

corridor. Specific items that should be brought into the funding umbrella to assure their construction are RTP#'s 1004, 1031, 1195, and 1196.

- Barbur Boulevard structures over Vermont and Newberry, in the vicinity of the northerly Capitol Highway/Barbur intersection. Five years ago ODOT performed emergency repairs to these structures while heavy traffic was detoured through residential areas. They indicated at that time the remaining physical life of these timber structures was 10 years. Reconstruction of these structures, with the addition of appropriate bike and pedestrian facilities, must be included in the immediate time frame.
- Key projects for moving traffic through SW Portland have not been included within the 2025 RTP Financially constrained system. These projects would provide relief to the I-5/Barbur/South Portland corridor. Specific items that should be brought into the funding umbrella to assure their construction are RTP#'s 1004, 1031, 1195, and 1196.

Sincerely,



Glenn Bridger,
President, SW Neighborhoods, Inc.



Lillie Fitzpatrick
Transportation Committee Chair,
SW Neighborhoods, Inc.

cc: John Gillam, Laurel Wentworth

Connections

Business Districts:

Downtown - Rose Quarter -

Lloyd - Hollywood -

82nd Ave - Gateway

Neighborhoods:

Directly serves 14 inner eastside

Portland neighborhoods

Within ¼ Mile:

- 15 Parks
- 23 Schools and Playgrounds

3817 N. Williams Ave 97227

Connections

Transit:

- All 8 Max stations
- 22 Bus lines
- All 3 Transit Centers

Bikeways:






- Serves 16 City Bikeways
- Regional links via the I-205 Trail and the Eastside Esplanade/OMSI-to-Springwater




Walking:




- 50 potential access points on north side
- 17 existing bridges links south side









Barfield Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Project

Legend

-  Schools
-  Library
-  Hospital
-  Max Stop
-  Parks

-  Env Zone
-  Rivers
- Zoning**
-  Other

- Land Uses**
-  COM
-  IND
-  MFR


-  MUC
-  POS
-  RUR
-  SFR
-  Nbhd. Boundary
-  Max Line
-  Railroad
-  Buslines

Major Arterials TYPE

-  Freeways
-  Major Streets



0 0.25 0.5 1 Miles



December 4, 2003

Kim Ellis
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97232

RE: RTP Update Public Comments

Dear Ms. Ellis:

The City of Wilsonville has the following comments regarding the draft 2004 RTP Update:

1. Place the entire Wilsonville Road Interchange project within the Financially Constrained list, not just the PE and ROW with construction on the Preferred List. This is important because this project has been identified as a high priority project both by the City and by ODOT, as well as regional and federal partners who participated in ODOT's 2002 Freeway Access Study.

The critical nature of this project is evidence by the City of Wilsonville's commitment of \$3.5 million in the city's current budget to begin Phase 1 of the needed improvements. However, this is a very limited fix to the problems that exist at the interchange and a more comprehensive solution is now moving through the OTIA 3 process as a freight mobility project. Placing the entire project on the Financially Constrained list recognizes the level of significance this project has on the I-5 south metro region and for freight mobility.

In response to the proposed update to the RTP System Maps, the City has attached an updated map of our major freight distribution centers and truck terminals (see Figure 3a). There are several industrial areas in south Wilsonville that utilize the Wilsonville Road Interchange on a daily basis and the importance of improving the interchange for freight mobility and safety can not be emphasized enough.

2. As submitted at the October 29, 2003 TPAC Workshop, the City of Wilsonville has re-evaluated two project priorities since the last update of the financially constrained list and they would include the following changes to the draft 2004 RTP:
 - Remove project #6091, the Boeckman Road/I-5 Overcrossing, from the financially constrained list and move it to the preferred system. The project total in the draft RTP is \$9,890,000.
 - Add project #6093, the Barber Street extension to the financially constrained list. The project total in the draft RTP is \$7,310,000.

As you can see, this would remove a burden of more than \$2.5 million from the financially constrained system. The Barber Street Extension project was determined to be a higher priority project because of its ability to have a greater impact on providing relief to the Wilsonville Road Interchange. This was concluded as part of the *I-5/Wilsonville Freeway Access Study*, which was prepared by DKS Associates in November of 2002 in coordination with ODOT, Metro, and the City of Wilsonville.

3. UPDATE Appendix 4 – Transportation Analysis Zone Assumptions, does not list Wilsonville as an Industrial Area (pg. 3) under 2040 Grouping. With Interstate 5 running through the middle of Wilsonville, the City has a significant Industrial land base which utilizes both the Wilsonville Road Interchange and Stafford Road Interchange. The majority of our industrial areas are located near established street and transit routes, therefore the City of Wilsonville should be included as a Tier 1 Industrial area.
4. The City has reviewed the proposed Policy Map Updates and there are several changes to be made to have the maps reflect the City's Transportation Systems Plan. The proposed modifications are summarized in a spreadsheet and shown on several figures attached to this letter.
5. In Appendix 8, under Title 6: Regional Accessibility, Regional Street Designs, the City of Wilsonville should now meet compliance with the adoption of the Transportation Systems Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments on the draft 2004 RTP Update. If you have any questions, please call Danielle Cowan, Public Affairs Director, at (503) 682-1011 or Laurel Byer, Assistant City Engineer, at (503) 682-4960.

Sincerely,



Arlene Loble
City Manager

LB:

Attachments

- c: Eldon Johansen, Community Development Director
Mike Stone, City Engineer
Laurel Byer, Assistant City Engineer
Danielle Cowan, Public Affairs Director

HON. EUGENE GRANT
Mayor

ROBERT BROOKS
JEFF DULCICH
JONATHAN EDWARDS
ROB WHEELER

City Manager
CLINT HOLMES

Assistant City Manager
City Recorder
WANDA KUPPLER

City of Happy Valley



12915 S.E. KING ROAD
HAPPY VALLEY, OR 97236-6298
TELEPHONE (503) 760-3325
FAX (503) 760-9397
Web site: www.happy-valley.org

Metro Council
Via hand delivery

Re: Mount Scott Creek Trail Project #48


Dear Councilors:

The Mount Scott Creek Trail was included in 1992 in the Metro Regional Trail plan as Project # 48. A segment of that project in Happy Valley has already been completed. With the completion of the new Sunnyside road bridge over Mt. Scott Creek the time is right to proceed to connect the Springwater trail on the north of Happy Valley with the existing trails on the portion of Mt. Talbert owned by Metro that is located just south of Happy Valley. This trail would allow for bicycle and pedestrian access to extensive trails in both north and south directions from Happy Valley. As you know Happy Valley is in great need of these means to get its residents out of their cars and exercising their bodies. This trail will also provide a very useful means of pedestrian and bicycle access from Happy Valley to the shopping center that is located at 122nd and Sunnyside Road. Most importantly this trail will provide the fast growing population of Happy Valley with a trail connection to the premier Metro amenities in the vicinity to Powell Butte via the Springwater Corridor and to Mt. Talbert on the south. Happy Valley is very willing to provide local funds to help complete this trail, but needs the help that will come from adding this trail to the Regional Transportation Plan. The City Council considers this our number one trail priority and we thank you for consideration of helping us complete the trail.

Very Truly

Eugene Grant
Mayor

How to Comment on the update to the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan



The public comment period for the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) begins on October 31, 2003 and concludes with a public hearing on December 4, 2003. You may submit comments online at Metro's website:

www.metro-region.org/rtp

Comments and questions may also be mailed using the form below, or left on Metro's Transportation hotline at (503) 797-1900, Option 2.

Comments:

Highway 26 (Sunset Highway) Needs AN expansion of at least one lane on each side from Highway 217 interchange west to Cornelius Pass Rd. Building this infrastructure will support Oregon's economic recovery AND increase our ability to move goods, services and people. Clatsop, Columbia & Washington County citizens would benefit significantly with short commute time thus being able to spend more time with their families. Business will benefit with faster delivery times (over)

Submitted by:

Tim Phillips

Name

220 NW 2nd Ave Suite 930 Portland, OR 97209

Street Address

City/Zip

503-224-0010

Phone

~~Tim~~ Tphillips@phillipsANDco.com

E-Mail

Send me more info:



2000 RTP Document CD

Other RTP Info:

Expansion of Hwy 26 from Hwy 217 to Cornelius Pass Rd.




Please add me to the RTP interested citizens mailing/e-mail lists

And quicker access to distribution hubs.

The existing infrastructure is over loaded and is a significant bottleneck for commuters, truck traffic AND service vehicles

The new lanes could be designed for High Occupancy Vehicles or for truck traffic only. A final decision for the use of the new infrastructure would require a refinement study to determine the most efficient traffic usage and air quality impact.



The Columbia Slough Watershed Council

7040 NE 47th Avenue Portland, Oregon 97218-1212

Tel: 503.281.1132 Fax: 503.281.5187 Email: jay.mower@columbiaslough.org
www.columbiaslough.org

Jay Mower, Coordinator

Date: December 4, 2003

To: Metro Council

From: Jay Mower, Coordinator
Columbia Slough Watershed Council

RTP # 4076

Re: Support for including the Columbia Slough Trail in RTP

One of my earliest civic activities after moving to Portland in 1991 was taking a community-sponsored walk on the yet-unfinished Springwater Corridor Trail. Over the years I have seen the benefits that this tremendous transportation feature provides to the public.

Metro knows that in order to achieve a balanced transportation system it is important to include multi-use trails in the Regional Transportation Plan. Providing citizens choices other than the automobile is critical to building livable communities. I support this.

I want you to know there is strong support for regional trails in the Columbia Slough Watershed area. In June of this year, after much work, the Watershed Council completed a long awaited Watershed Action Plan. In developing this plan we interviewed business and land owners, and worked with a wide array of community members. Our job, as a Watershed Council, is to encourage the community to implement the Action Plan.

The Action Plan's highest category is called Top Priority. One of our Top Priority projects is: *Completion of the Columbia Slough Trail*. As you may know, portions of the Columbia Slough trail are finished – and if you been on the trail, you know how beautiful it is – but there are many missing links and gaps. A fully-completed trail will provide multiple benefits. For example, there are hundreds of businesses along the Slough. When it is finished I am confident workers will use the Columbia Slough trail to access jobs. There will be access from Interstate MAX, I-205 bike path, and multiple bus routes that cross or travel near the Slough.

The Columbia Slough Watershed Council urges that you add the Columbia Slough Trail to the RTP's financially constrained list. We support this action.

A feasibility study RTP # 4076
Thank you very much.

December 4, 2003

To: Metro Council Members
From: Jill Fuglister, Coalition for a Livable Future
Catherine Ciarlo, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Re: Comments on the 2004 RTP Update

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2004 update of the Regional Transportation Plan. On behalf of the Coalition for a Livable Future and the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, we would like to express our concern about the process of the update. We recognize that Metro is under considerable pressure to meet federally imposed deadlines. However, we believe the public has not been given an opportunity for meaningful involvement in an update that, far from being a "minor" update, will have a tremendous impact on the region's transportation system.

The Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF) is a coalition of 60 community organizations working to protect, restore, and maintain healthy, equitable, and sustainable communities in the greater Portland metropolitan region. The Bicycle Transportation Alliance (BTA) is a non-profit organization working to create healthy, sustainable communities by making bicycling safer, more convenient and more accessible in Oregon. Both organizations support Metro's Region 2040 vision for the Portland metro area as a place where people of all ages, incomes and ability have an array of daily transportation options available to them. We believe that this can only be accomplished by deliberate, strategic investment that ensures the development of complete networks for all modes of travel – including transit, walking and bicycling – as well as motor vehicles.

We are concerned that the current RTP update, in the crunch to meet a constrained timeline, will move the region away from the principles and modal goals set out in the 2000 RTP. Furthermore, the public has not had a meaningful opportunity to understand and comment on these changes. Characterized as a "housekeeping" update, the proposed revisions add over \$1.5 billion in projects to the Financially Constrained list, according to Table 1, *Summary of 2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project List Changes*.

Despite the scope of these proposed additions, Metro began work on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis on November 3, only three days after the public comment period opened. This raises a critical question: how would the Metro Council and JPACT respond if public comment were to reveal a lack of support for major projects being modeled? Clearly, with air quality modeling well underway, Metro would not be well positioned to respond in any meaningful fashion. Again, we understand that the region is facing tight deadlines with potentially significant effects. However, characterizing the update as "minor" is inaccurate at best.

The heart of CLF's and the BTA's concern about the update centers around the project mode split in the new Financially Constrained System. At the beginning of this RTP update, Metro staff laid out a set of guiding principles and targets that were to drive the update process. A key goal (driven by the need to keep the region in air quality compliance) was that project mode splits should remain relatively stable in the 2004 RTP Update process.

This goal has not been met. The table below is copied from Metro's public outreach materials, with a final column added. It reveals an 11% increase in road and bridge projects and a 14 % drop in transit dollars.

Distribution of Financially Constrained System Projects

| Balancing Modes of Transportation | [TARGET SPLIT] | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | 2000 RTP | Draft 2004 RTP | Change |
| Road and Bridge | 35% | 46% | +11% |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian | 7% | 9% | +2% |
| Transit Projects | 55% | 41% | -14% |
| Boulevard Projects | 3% | 4% | +1% |

While we recognize that the changes result from OTIA III, the availability of state funding should not preempt Metro's planning process. Furthermore, if the region is going to make such a substantial shift away from the mode split outlined in the 2000 RTP, the public should understand that shift and have a meaningful opportunity to comment on it. Again, such a change is hardly "housekeeping."

Recognizing that the region must move forward with this RTP update in order to meet federal deadlines, CLF and the BTA urge the Council to note that the project mix in this update does not reflect a well-thought-out, well-coordinated strategy to achieve a truly multi-modal transportation system.

Looking forward to the next major RTP update, we urge the Metro Council to set a clear goal of achieving a mode split that looks more like that contained in the 2000 RTP – a document developed with extensive and meaningful public involvement. With virtually no public process and little technical evaluation, the current RTP update with its substantially shifted mode split should be considered an interim document. It should not be the basis of future plans.

Specifically, CLF and the BTA request that the Council adopt a resolution to use the 2000 mode split as the starting point for the next RTP. Moving forward, we urge you to set even more aggressive targets for transit, bicycle and pedestrian mode shares to guide the next update.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We look forward to working with Metro, the region's jurisdictions, and its citizens on the 2006 RTP update.

Sincerely,

| | |
|---|---|
| Catherine Ciarlo Executive Director Bicycle Transportation Alliance | Jill Fuglister Coordinator Coalition for a Livable Future |
|---|---|



SW Hills Residential League
Post Office Box 1033 Portland, Oregon 97207
Tel (503)292-3716 Fax (503)292-3719
swhrl@yahoo.com

December 4, 2003

OFFICERS

Pamella Settlegoode, Ph.D.
President

Craig Olson
Vice-President

Margaret Hooten
Secretary

Ellen Prendergast
Treasurer

Mr. David Bragdon
METRO Council President
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

**RE: METRO REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN POLICY UPDATE
PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Dear Mr. Bragdon:

STAFF

Rita Pedersen
Executive Secretary

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Metro's Policy Update concerning the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). I have taken this occasion to review Metro's updated documents and compared its project highlights and amendments with proposals found in the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP).

SWHRL BOARD

Darren Bauer

David Blum

Barbara Devine

George Freund

John Grout

Margaret Hooten

Eileen Johnson

Nan Koerner

Mark LeRoux, Esq.

Liz Mason

Harris Matarazzo, Esq.

Craig Olson

Barbara Page

David Perzlik

Ellen Prendergast

Jeri Rauh

Aubrey Russell

Rick Seemel

Pamella Settlegoode, Ph.D.

Barbara Shettler

Jeff Simpson

Larry Springer

Ted Welsh

I speak to you as the President of SW Hills Residential League (SWHRL) on matters of concern in our neighborhood. The League was established and incorporated in 1969. We are recognized by the City as the official neighborhood association representing Portland's SW Hills neighborhood. That includes the Sunset Highway and the Terwilliger Parkway. Currently we have 23 Directors on our board who represent the various areas of the Neighborhood. We have been *Preserving Our Neighborhood's Heritage For 35 Years*. Today I speak of our neighborhood's future. I think you may know of our neighborhood—it's the one used familiarly by Portland civic leaders as a backdrop for the downtown livability. The Neighborhood is used by all Portlanders and visitors; we welcome that, but it has come with a cost.

The League is disappointed that the Metro Transportation Plan fails to recognize the true needs of the SW Hills. Conversely, Portland's Transportation System Plan continues to identify the Neighborhood's needs as genuine, just as they have done in past years—in their previous Twenty Year Transportation Plan. The problem is the City has not really done anything with the plan, except to construct lots of speed bumps on our neighborhood's streets. I will limit my remarks to two areas of the Metro plan: The Oregon Health Sciences University's (OHSU) Aerial Tram and Highway 26's Sunset Corridor. Metro proposes pumping millions and millions of transportation dollars into these two projects alone.

The OHSU Aerial Tram proposal, which we see you have allocated some \$ 15 million, does not adequately represent the authentic needs of the Neighborhood.

It's not innovative, rather it's elitist. Moreover, Metro should not be in the business of funding a private transportation system. It is noteworthy that many Oregonians have become cynical about the function and cost of big government bureaucracies, like Metro. The League is not a part of that movement. We remain optimistic about the potentials of government in solving problems. However, when Metro seemingly has abundant money to spend on risky, expensive and divisive projects, we pay attention. It is an outrageous waste of our transportation dollars. We strongly suggest deleting this project from Metro's Regional Transportation Plan, placing it reasonably where it belongs, in the Projects Dropped category. This would eliminate a burden of \$ 15 million from the financially constrained transportation system.

The League believes the City's proposal for the OHSU Aerial Tram is not responsive to the true needs of the Neighborhood and that it is irresponsible to use our City's transportation dollars to fund such a venture. OHSU and current city officials have underestimated the importance of cultivating friendly democratic relations with the leaders in our neighborhood system. Lately their theme resembles, "Damn the torpedoes! Full steam ahead!" It's not the Portland Way. SW Hills residents would definitely not identify one of our transportation needs as an aerial tram traveling above our streets. It is utterly not needed and it has been a highly divisive issue in all of the neighborhoods located in the OHSU vicinity (Homestead, Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill, Hillsdale and SWHRL). OHSU has become committed to building higher and higher fences in the Neighborhood, mostly beneficial to themselves and their developers. Metro is adding fuel to the fire by proposing it partially fund this private and very expensive private transportation venture. Lastly, on this matter, there exist no compelling reason to build an aerial tram in the Neighborhood and it certainly does not conform to the City's own transportation plan. Portland's Transportation System Plan is highly supportive of making "it more convenient for people to walk, bicycle, use transit and drive less to meet their daily needs. By "transit" we assumed they meant public transportation, not private. The league joins collectively with other neighborhood associations in urging Metro to focus funding on public oriented projects that are highly beneficial to public and neighborhood needs.

Our second area of concern is Highway 26's Sunset Corridor. This is a portrait of a monstrous transportation failure. It's appearance is revolting, its congestion, noise, pollution and injury are legendary, yet Metro continues to propose spending millions and millions of transportation dollars improving this funnel. That is precisely what it is, a transportation funnel, because no matter how many lanes you add or improve, it still must pass through the tunnel entering or exiting the downtown. There's no getting around that fact. It's Paradise Lost and the concrete walls constructed to hold back Mother Nature's landscape resembles something from a dystopian science fiction scene, where humanity is diminished, cast aside to make room for machines. It's about as disastrous as it gets. It's not the future, it's the past and it's a huge failure. Apparently Metro still believes the automobile is indomitable, however there exist urban transportation models that promote the use of public transportation. Rather than perpetuating a poor transportation model, which has wasted enormous amounts of human time and resources the League proposes that a different trajectory be funded, one geared toward viable mass transit and multi-use transit ways for non-motorized travelers. We feel that reasonable progress can be

made toward constructing such transportation models if Metro refocuses the funding and expertise there. Portland needs the leadership to thoroughly prepare us for the future. Sadly Metro's current proposals falls short of meeting this need, as well as failing to address the here and now.

Back in the heyday of the civil rights movement, a wonderful, eloquent speaker, Fannie Lou Hamer, observed that she was sick and tired or being sick and tired. Well, that statement today nicely summarizes how many SW Hills residents feel. We live in an area of the City with no real multi-use transit ways, that are separated from increasingly speeding motor vehicle traffic. Intriguingly, every Twenty Year Plan that comes along identifies the same streets to be improved for a new generation. But it never seems to get done. The City's Transportation System Plan is the latest version of these prospects. In its introduction, City transportation leaders argues that "alternative approaches must be used to ensure integrated, comprehensive solutions." Our neighborhood loves this idea. Many of the streets identified for improvements in this current version have appeared before, so it leave us perpetually wondering what happened during the last twenty years. The streets and project numbers are as follows:

90001 Davenport
90024 Broadway
90029 Capitol
90031 Dosch
90034 Hamilton
90038 Humphrey
90049 Marquam
90054 Patton
90063 Sunset

There^{ore} all there again cited for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Certainly we would add SW Fairmount Boulevard to the streets identified. Fairmount is a scenic destination for all Portlanders and is long overdue for pedestrian improvements.

In sum, SW Hills Residential League recommends the following:

- *Delete funding for the OHSU Aerial Tram project
- *Direct the Metro staff planners to focus their talents on solving the Sunset Corridor's problems in practical and intelligent ways that utilize viable modern models
- *Direct the Metro staff planners to undertake a comprehensive update of the RTP, coordinating it thoroughly with the City's TSP
- *Re-direct the millions of dollars these additions will save the regional transportation program toward the "alternative approaches" Portland's transportation experts suggest


*Moving up the program years for the SW Hills street projects to 2004-10

SW Hills Residential League supports our City's vision for making our neighborhood's streets safe and friendly for non-motorized travelers. We believe such transportation improvement programs should be a transportation priority at Metro. In the SW Hills, the transportation experts long ago took away the Neighborhood's streetcars, which delivered people efficiently and safely up and down the hills and throughout the downtown. What has evolved are very large, noisy and polluting cars, that travel at very high speeds, up and down our narrow, windy, hilly and scenic streets. It's scary and the majority of people in the Neighborhood recognize this dangerous condition. There's a strong feeling that residents must transport themselves and their loved ones in cars, in order to protect themselves. In a sense, we've become caged birds with our cars and it only exacerbates the problem.

There's a systematic practice of denying Southwest neighborhoods their due. Metro and Portland's decisions in planning priorities have deprived us of safely being able to walk our streets, which remain largely devoid of transit ways for non-motorized people. There needs to be a corrective plan in place that promotes people not their automobiles. Metro's leadership can be the major catalyst for changing these deplorable conditions. Designing, funding and constructing a SW Hills transit way, for all Portlanders to utilize, would reverse the course of past actions.

Thank you for your attention to this very sensitive issue. SW Hills Residential League and our neighbors and friends look forward to working with Metro and City transportation leaders on these proposals in the near future.

Sincerely,



Pamella E. Settlegoode, Ph.D.
President SWHRL

C: Rod Monroe, Metro District 6
Andy Cotugno, Metro Planning Director
Commissioner Jim Francesconi
Brant Williams, PDOT Director
Deena Platman, PDOT Planner



METRO

2004 RTP UPDATE

Summary of Recommendations on Public Comments Received

December 5 – December 10, 2003

Consent Items

PACKET 1 – POLICY UPDATE

No additional comments received.

PACKET 2 – PROJECT UPDATE

Comment 131: Add Project #2041 (257th Avenue improvements) to the Table 1 summary of financially constrained system changes. Project is included in the Oct. 31, 2003 financially constrained project list, but is not shown on Table 1. (Multnomah County, 12/09/03)

Staff Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 132: Add Project #2124 (Halsey St. improvements) to the Table 1 summary of financially constrained system changes. Project is included in the Oct. 31, 2003 financially constrained project list, but is not shown on Table 1. Update project cost to be \$3,240,000. (Multnomah County, 12/09/03)

Staff Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 133: Delete Project #2120 (Sandy Boulevard improvements) from the Table 1 summary of financially constrained system changes. This project is not included in the Oct. 31, 2003 financially constrained project list, but is shown on Table 1. (Multnomah County, 12/09/03)

Staff Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment 134: Withdraw request of November 12, 2003 (Comment #38) to remove Project #1199 - Barbur Boulevard Pedestrian Access to Transit Improvements from the Financially Constrained System. Unlike other larger scale projects planned along the I-5/Barbur corridor, this project is smaller in scope, more flexible in design regarding adjacent land uses and helps implement the Barbur Boulevard Streetscape Plan. These projects are not dependent upon recommendations that may result from the Regional Corridor Planning

Program for the I-5/Barbur corridor. Retain this project in the Financially Constrained system and advance it to the 2004-2009 timeframe. (City of Portland, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

Comment: 135: Project #1095 (Barbur Blvd multi-modal improvements). This project was promised to SW Portland in lieu of having much of it done by ODOT when Barbur was repaved in 1999. That promise should be kept. The Barbur Corridor Study is desired to identify the new southbound on-ramp prior to Capitol Highway South, and the changes needed at Capitol Highway and Barbur. (Don Baack, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: See Recommendation in Comment #134. This project will be included in the financially constrained system.

Comment 136: Project #1193 could be put off for a few years until 1096 the I-5 Barbur 405-217 Corridor is complete. It is my understanding that 1096 is in the financially constrained alternative. If it is not, it needs to be made a part of the constrained system. It is key to many changes in SW Portland. (Don Baack, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: No change recommended. Project #1096 is not in the financially constrained. Other corridors have been identified as higher priorities at this time.

Comment 137: Add a project to complete earthquake retrofitting for the bridge on Capitol Highway over SW Bertha Blvd, repairs or replacement to Vermont and Newberry Structures (Bridges) on Barbur just south of the north connection with I-5. (Don Baack, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: See TPAC Recommendation to Comment 125.

Comment 138: A lot of money is proposed for the North Macadam area including Naito Parkway, connections to the Ross Island Bridge, etc. No attention has been paid to the direct connections to I-405, I-5 while much attention has been directed to getting the spaghetti out of the east end of the Ross Island Bridge. The direct connections to the freeways are the logical next steps in implementing the North Macadam plan, not messing around with the traffic that will not be there when the direct connections are completed. Make this project a top priority, taking funds from all the other projects designed to enhance North Macadam. (Don Baack, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: See TPAC Recommendation to Comment 124.

Comment 139: Pedestrian bridge over I-5 and adjacent streets associated with the North Macadam project should be specified as such to make sure the funds are not diverted to another project. I understand it is a \$5,000,000 or so project. (Don Baack, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: No change recommended. Project #1200 is not proposed to be included in the financially constrained at this time. Other priority projects have been included for this area.

PACKET 3 – TECHNICAL UPDATE

Comment 140: Do not make changes recommended in Section 6.2 (Demonstration of Compliance with State Requirements) based on TPAC recommendation in Comment #1, and provide clarifying language in introduction and Section 6.1 (Demonstration of Compliance with Federal Requirements) that this update will only address federal planning requirements. (Metro staff, 12/10/03)

Staff Recommendation: Agree. Amend as requested.

OTHER

Comment 141: The RTP update has not adequately addressed increased levels of noise pollution due to transportation. The main noise generators I have observed are 1) unmuffled heavy trucks routinely using illegal exhaust/compression system brakes, 2) increased tire and engine noise due to increasing vehicle speeds both legal and above the legal limit, 3) heavy increases in the number of illegally muffled Harley-davidson motorcycles being operated, 4) huge increases in the number of modified "performance" resonator type exhaust vehicles being driven, 5) poor education, general confusion, and lack of will at the local jurisdiction levels to enforce what few vehicle noise emission laws are currently in force. The lack of enforcement of federal and state motor vehicle noise emission laws is the main problem with regional and local planning. (Roger Elligsen, 12/8/03)

Staff Recommendation: No change recommended. Noise ordinances are regulated and monitored locally. This comment will be forwarded to local governments.

Dept. of Business and Community Services

MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

Land Use and Transportation Program

1600 SE 190th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97233-5910
(503) 988-5050

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kim Ellis
Metro

FROM: Ed Abrahamson *EA*
Principal Planner

RE: Corrections to Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List

A review of 2004 RTP Project Update document revealed a number of Multnomah County projects that required corrections, as follows:

- #2041—257th Ave., Division St. to Powell Valley Rd.: Project is included in the Financially Constrained List but was left off the Table 1 summary list.
- #2120—Sandy Blvd. Bike/Ped project: Remove project from Table 1 and RTP
- #2124—Halsey St., 238th Ave. to Historic Columbia River Highway: Project is included in the Financially Constrained List but was omitted from Table 1 summary list. Project cost should be changed to \$3,240,000.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please call me at (503) 988-5050 x29620.

EACK 2885.MEM (TRANPRTP520)

Subject: RTP Amendment Request

Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2003 2:41 PM

From: Gillam, John <John.Gillam@pdxtrans.org>

To: "'ellisk@metro.dst.or.us"' ellisk@metro.dst.or.us

Cc: "Wentworth, Laurel" Laurel.Wentworth@pdxtrans.org, "Platman, Deena"
Deena.Platman@pdxtrans.org

Kim: As we discussed on the phone, we want to withdraw our request of Nov. 12 to move project #1199 - Barbur Blvd. Pedestrian Access to Transit Improvements from the Financially Constrained system to the Preferred system. Unlike other larger scale projects planned along the I-5/Barbur corridor, this project is smaller in scope, more flexible in design regarding adjacent land uses and helps implement the Barbur Boulevard Streetscape Plan. These projects are not dependent upon recommendations that may result from the Regional Corridor Planning Program for the I-5/Barbur corridor. Please retain this project in the Financially Constrained system and advance it to the 2004-2009 timeframe.

Subject: TPlan 2000 update comments to go into record. Request for response.

Date: Monday, December 8, 2003 8:01 PM

From: Roger M. Ellingson <rogere@rmegen.net>

To: Trans System Accounts trans@metro.dst.or.us

Hello,

I am writing to be put on the record for the 2000 transportation plan update review. I am concerned that the regional transportation plan is not taking into account the increased levels of transportation system noise pollution around the metro area and the impact this is having on regional livability.

I have measured the traffic noise pollution levels at my home which is located in a residential area adjacent to SW Barnes Road. The levels exceed the 66-67dBA State of Oregon and Federal guidelines for this type of developed area 50% of the time. 10% of the time the noise levels are twice the standards. The noise peaks due to unmuffled vehicle exhaust routinely exceed 100dBA SPL! All measurements are taken in a position recommended by a Ph.D. noise expert. These problems I have at my home are not unique to the Metro area.

The main noise generators I have observed are 1) unmuffled heavy trucks routinely using illegal exhaust/compression system brakes, 2) increased tire and engine noise due to increasing vehicle speeds both legal and above the legal limit, 3) heavy increases in the number of illegally muffled Harley-davidson motorcycles being operated, 4) huge increases in the number of modified "performance" resonator type exhaust vehicles being driven, 5) poor education, general confusion, and lack of will at the local jurisdiction levels to enforce what few vehicle noise emission laws are currently in force.

According to FHWA documents the main contributors to vehicle noise pollution are medium and heavy trucks. All transportation system planning is based upon these estimates. But the problem with metro and local transportation planning is the lack of enforcement of federal and state motor vehicle noise emission laws. If the laws are not enforced, then transportation system planning does not work either. There needs to be a balance to the overall system. Sound transportation system planning must be based upon sound foundational principles.

Upon further investigation, I and others have found there is no coordination between jurisdictions across the Metro area regarding noise pollution. Some cities have recently updated noise ordinances, but other areas like Washington County where I live have consciously avoided addressing the noise pollution levels from associated traffic impacts for decades. To our knowledge, Metro does not have any policy, knowledge, or understanding of the noise pollution impacts of the transportation system either.

I request that Metro review the current planning being undertaken to account for the items I have pointed out in this letter. I will be looking forward to hearing exactly how Metro and the Joint commission will be addressing this regional livability deficiency and how I can help.

Thank you for responding to this request.

Sincerely yours,

Roger M. Ellingson

8515 SW Barnes Road

Portland, OR 97225

503 297 5044

Subject: FW: Comments on RTP 2004 12/10/2003

Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2003 6:54 PM

From: Tom Kloster <klostert@metro.dst.or.us>

To: Kim Ellis ellisk@metro.dst.or.us

Another set...

----- Forwarded Message

From: Don Baack <baack@pacifier.com>

Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 16:27:14 -0800

To: klostert@metro.dst.or.us, mclains@metro.dst.or.us,
monroer@metro.dst.or.us, parkr@metro.dst.or.us, hostickac@metro.dst.or.us,
bragdond@metro.dst.or.us, burkholder@metro.dst.or.us,
newmanb@metro.dst.or.us

Cc: gbridger@teleport.com, gbridger@yahoo.com, "L Fitzpatrick" <lf@pdx.edu>,
lgard@spiritone.com, sbogert@spiritone.com, psettlegoode@msn.com

Subject: Comments on RTP 2004 12/10/2003

December 10, 2003 4:15 pm.

I have the following comments on the RTP 10/31/2004 draft as it relates to SW Portland. The numbers refer to the Project List #.

First of all, please pass a resolution requiring each member city to adopt the amendments to the RTP after a suitable previously announced comment period to permit the citizens of each of these cities an opportunity to comment and make their views known. The current game rules make it an insiders game and not what we the citizens need or want.

1095 Barbur Blvd multi-modal improvements 15,000,000. This project was promised to SW Portland in lieu of having much of it done by ODOT when Barbur was re paved in 1999. We were promised it would be receive funding priority. That promise should be kept. The Barbur Corridor Study is desired to identify the new southbound on-ramp prior to Capitol Highway South, and the changes needed at Capitol Highway and Barbur.

1193 could be put off for a few years until 1096 the I-5 Barbur 405-217 Corridor is complete. It is my understanding that 1096 is in the financially constrained alternative. If it is not, it needs to be made a part of the constrained system. It is key to many changes in SW Portland.

Cannot find: Earthquake retrofitting for the bridge on Capitol Highway over SW Bertha Blvd, repairs or replacement to Vermont and Newberry Structures (Bridges) on Barbur just south of the north connection with I-5. They should be in the plan.

North MacAdam: A huge pile of money is proposed for this area including Naito Parkway, connections to the Ross Island Bridge, etc. No attention has been paid to the direct connections to I-405, I-5 while much attention has been directed to getting the spaghetti out of the east end of the Ross Island Bridge. The direct connections to the freeways are the logical next steps in implementing the North MacAdam plan, not messing around with the traffic that will not be there when the direct connections are completed. Make this project a top priority, taking funds from all the other projects designed to enhance North MacAdam.

Pedestrian bridge over I-5 and adjacent streets associated with the North MacAdam project should be specified as such to make sure the funds are not diverted to another project. I understand it is a \$5,000,000 or so project.

Don Baack

6495 SW Burlingame Place

Portland, OR 97239-7001

503-246-2088

Baack@pacifier.com

SWTrails Web Site <http://explorepx.com/swtrails.html>

Hillsdale Neighborhood Web Site <http://explorepx.com/hnameet.html>

----- End of Forwarded Message

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| FOR THE PURPOSE OF APROVING THE 2004-07 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA. |) | RESOLUTION NO. 03- 3381 |
| |) | |
| |) | Introduced by Councilor Rod Park; JPACT Chair |

WHEREAS, the Portland metropolitan area Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), which reports on the programming of all federal transportation funds to be spent in the region, must be updated every two years in compliance with federal regulations, and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have recently proposed programming of the "regional flexible funds" portion of the federal allocation of transportation funds to this region through the Transportation Priorities 2004-07 process, and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation has proposed programming of federal transportation funds for projects in the Portland metropolitan area through the State Transportation Improvement Program, and

WHEREAS, the transit service providers TriMet and South Metropolitan Area Rapid Transit (SMART) have proposed programming of federal transit funds, and

WHEREAS, these proposed programming of funds must be found in compliance with all relevant federal law and administrative rules, including a demonstration of compliance with the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality, and

WHEREAS, the draft Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, attached as Exhibit A, demonstrates compliance with all relevant federal law and administrative rules, and

WHEREAS, the companion Metro Resolution No. 03-3382 demonstrates compliance with the federal Clean Air Act and the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality, and

WHEREAS, a public process has provided an opportunity for comments on the programming of federal funds to specific projects in specific fiscal years and whether that programming meets all relevant laws and regulations, in addition to the extensive public processes used to select those projects to receive these funds; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council adopt the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland metropolitan area as shown in Exhibit A.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Metro Council transfer \$549,000 from preliminary engineering of the Harmony Road widening project (SE Lake Road to SE 82nd Avenue) to preliminary engineering of the 172nd Avenue widening project (SE Sunnyside Road to Oregon Highway 212) as shown in Exhibit A and as requested in Exhibit B.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 11th day of December, 2003

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

Exhibit B

Transfer of funds request; \$549,000

From: preliminary engineering of SE Harmony Road widening: SE Lake Road to SE 82nd Avenue.

To: preliminary engineering of SE 172nd Avenue widening: SE Sunnyside Road to Oregon Highway 212.



METRO

**TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES 2004-07:
Investing in the 2040 Growth Concept**

APPLICATION FORM

(complete this cover form for each candidate project or program)

1. **Project/Program Title:** 172nd – Highway-212 to Sunnyside Road
2. **RTP Project No.:** RTP # 7000
3. **Lead Agency:** Clackamas County
4. **Agency Contact:**

- a. Name Ronald Weinman
- b. Title Transportation Principal Transportation Planner
- c. Phone (503) 353-4533
- d. Fax (503) 353-4559
- e. E-mail (if any) ronw@co.clackamas.or.us

Mailing Address:

Clackamas County
Department of Transportation and Development
9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd
Clackamas, Oregon 97015

5. Project Cost/Requested Funds (PLEASE PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM):

| | PE | ROW | CONSTRUCTION | TOTAL |
|--------------|--------------------|-----|--------------|---------------------|
| Federal | \$ 549,000 | | | \$ 549,000 |
| Local | \$ 494,460 | | | \$ 494,460 |
| Other | | | \$15,000,000 | |
| TOTAL | \$1,043,460 | | | \$16,043,460 |

6. Project/Program Description (summary for public presentation purposes, use 8.5" x 11" sheets)

a. Street or facility: **172nd Avenue**

b. Termini or project boundaries: **Highway-212 to Sunnyside Road**

c. Brief physical description of main project features (e.g., length, number and width of lanes, bike lanes and/or sidewalks, bridge crossings, medians, planting strip, etc.)

This request is for funding the environmental document for the 172nd Avenue project from SE Highway-212 to Sunnyside Road. The project is planned to be a five lane arterial with bike lanes and sidewalks. This phase would start the process to determine the needs within this corridor and determine the impacts the proposal would have on the adjacent land uses. This project is located within the just added Damascus UGB area adjacent to the existing Clackamas Industrial area. Clackamas County is working on fast tracking this industrial site (west of 172nd) to be a shovel ready industrial site in two years. The project is within the RTP financially constrained system.

d. Explain current transportation problem and how the nominated project would address the problem. **172nd Avenue is currently operating at an unacceptable Level-of-Service at the intersections of Highway-212/ Armstrong Circle (172nd) and Sunnyside/ 172nd intersection. Besides providing access to the Clackamas Regional Center, this is the main road for the existing Sunnyside, Happy Valley communities and the future Damascus community that was just added to the UGB. Based on the County's transportation system plan the Damascus Concept Study (TGM grant), by the year 2020 172nd Avenue will require at least five lanes to operate at an acceptable Level-of-Service. In addition, the Highway-212 intersection with Armstrong Circle has been identified as one of ODOT priority SPIS projects and has awarded Hazard elimination program (HEP) funds to extend 172nd to Highway-212 and eliminate the Armstrong Circle intersection.**

e. Provide photo(s) of project area; digital preferred (no more than three).

f. Attach 8.5" X 11" vicinity map indicating project and nearest major arterial intersection.

g. Complete the ODOT Local Agency Federal Aid Project Agreement (Attachment A). Consult with your ODOT Local Agency Program Coordinator (Mark Foster at 503-731-8288, Lelisa Rozendal at 503-731-8595 or Tom Weatherford at 503-731-8238) if you have questions regarding elements of the form.

h. Describe any significant aspects of the project that transcend technical evaluation (Attachment B).

i. See the special instructions with the criteria and measures description for each modal category. Make sure the project description addresses all special instructions and any other necessary attachment is completed. **Attachment C is included. However, the other special attachments are not applicable.**

j. Review the public involvement checklist (Attachment G) and answer items 1 through 10 for all candidate projects that are not a part of the RTP financially constrained system or answer item 10 for all candidate projects that are a part of the RTP financially constrained system.

Measure of Level of Community Focus

(for projects serving mixed use areas and inner/outer neighborhoods)

Up to 20 points will be awarded for how well a project leverages or complements development of other center activities. Consideration will be given to the maturity of a mixed-use area, the level of community commitment to achieve a dynamic, mixed use, community center and the impact the proposed project will have on implementing a mixed-use area. (20 points; use additional sheets as necessary)

1. Progress in developing and quality of the mixed-use center¹ (10 points)

What level of planning and planning implementation are completed in the priority land-use area?

- ☒ Concept or vision plan only
- ☐ Comprehensive plan adopted
- ☐ New zoning in compliance with comprehensive or concept plan adopted
- ☐ New development code regulations in compliance with comprehensive or concept plan adopted
- ☐ Plan is in compliance with 2040 target densities.

What financial tools are available for mixed-use plan implementation?

- ☒ Market based implementation plan adopted²
- ☐ Tax increment financing available or programmed/budgeted; amount \$ _____ (if known)
- ☐ Local improvement district funding available or programmed/budgeted; amount \$ _____ (if known)
- ☐ Tax abatement program available or programmed/budgeted; amount \$ _____ (if known)
- ☐ General fund monies programmed or budgeted; amount \$ _____ (if known)
- ☒ Other; please specify: **Transportation System Development Charge, \$450,000**

Have/are other civic investments being made (i.e., public buildings, plazas/promenades, etc.)?

- ☐ Yes ☐ Please list: Hwy-212/Armstrong Circle intersection

Have/are other private investments being made?

- ☒ Yes ☐ Please list: **industrial development adjacent to 172nd**

Describe or list a sample of key associations and individuals that are committed to the development of your priority mixed-use area as a center/focus of the community.

City of Happy Valley, Rock Creek CPO, Damascus CPO,

Describe other community or cultural activities (farmer's market, street fairs, volunteer efforts) that are a part of your mixed-use area. **This area is in the process of being plan with this Rock Creek area being the first area to develop a concept likely be industrial**

2. Local objectives (10 points)

Describe how this project would help implement or complement key local development, economic and other policy objectives. Describe job retention and growth issues, new development or other community investments that would be leveraged or served, policy support for investment in the area and any other local initiative to support the viability of the area. (Limit responses to 500 words or less)

¹ Based on Metro's report "Ten Principles for Achieving 2040 Centers."

² A market-based implementation plan is a development strategy based on a market analysis of the location of the center, the market area or geography it serves, service competition from other areas for the target market, land values, density levels, access, price, quality and demand.

12,000 acres was added the Urban Growth Boundary within the Damascus area east of 152nd. Two studies have show that Clackamas County needs between 1732 to 2500 acres of addition industrial land. To meet this need, within the

Damascus area, it is expected that at least 1650 acres of this new urban area would be industrial that will help to address the County's Job/housing imbalance. To be able to develop this industrial land, the Damascus area will need considerable public and private investment in infrastructure to support urbanization.

To start the process of developing this industrial land, the County has started the Rock Creek Concept plan that will look at 300 acres west of 172nd, north of Highway-212 and east of Rock Creek. This area is planned to be the first area in the Damascus area to be urbanized and developed as an industrial site. It is a site that all of the services (water, sewer, electricity, natural gas and telecommunication) are on site except for transportation. This site is in process of being designated as "shovel ready" and as an "Opportunity Site" under the Governors Industrials Site Certification program. It is expected that this site would provide for at least 3500 new industrial jobs.

172nd Avenue can be regarded as the north/ south backbone and the key transportation facility for this Rock Creek industrial site to be developed. The RTP shows that 172nd is in the financially constrained system needed to be 5 lanes to handle the expected The 172nd project can be constructed in phases with first phase being the section from Highway-212 to Sunnyside Road.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3381, FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE 2004-07 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA.

Date: November 20, 2003

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a report that summarizes all programming of federal transportation funding in the Metro region for the federal fiscal years 2004 through 2007 and demonstrates that the use of these funds will comply with all relevant federal laws and administrative rules.

Generally, there are three sources of proposed programming of federal transportation funds that are reflected in the MTIP; "regional flexible funds" whose projects are selected in the Transportation Priorities process by JPACT and the Metro Council, projects and maintenance on the national highway system proposed by the Oregon Department of Transportation through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process, and transit projects proposed by the region's transit agencies. Federal regulations designate JPACT and the Metro Council as the bodies responsible for allocating the comprehensive package of federal highway and transit funds for the Portland metropolitan area.

The projects and programs recently selected by JPACT and the Metro Council to receive regional flexible funds for the years 2006 and 2007 have been assigned to their respective years of allocation and fund type (Surface Transportation Program or Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality) in the MTIP. Furthermore, previous programming of these funds for the years 2004 and 2005 have been updated to reflect changes in construction schedules and project costs.

Adoption of this resolution will also serve as approval to transfer \$549,000 for preliminary engineering of the Harmony Road widening project to a preliminary engineering of widening 172nd Avenue to five lanes between Sunnyside Road and Highway 212. Documentation of this transfer request is provided in Exhibit B to this resolution.

The programming of state highway funds is proposed through the state wide State Transportation Improvement Program process. Projects and programs within the Metro region are summarized within the MTIP. Projects the increase vehicle capacity is included in the total cost report: Table 4.1. Other state projects: bridge rehabilitation, pavement preservation, safety, and operations are summarized in Tables 4.2.1 through 4.2.4. JPACT and Metro Council commented on the metropolitan portion of the STIP during the public comment period of that process on January 16, 2003. That comment letter is included in the MTIP as Appendix 10.

The programming of federal transit funds to the metropolitan region is summarized in Table 2.2-1. In addition to the regional flexible funds programmed to transit activities through the Transportation Priorities process, there are several types of federal funds summarized, including rail new starts, a program for low income access to jobs, allocations for bus purchases and allocations for maintenance of the bus and rail systems.

Adoption of this resolution would fulfill JPACT and the Metro Council's role within federal law to program federal funds, consistent with federal regulations as documented in Exhibit A; the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland metropolitan area, federal fiscal years 2004 through 2007.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** This resolution programs transportation funds in accordance with the federal transportation authorizing legislation (currently known as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or TEA-21). The allocation process is intended to implement the Transportation Priorities 2004-07 program policies as defined by Metro Resolution No. 02-3206. This MTIP must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, which would be accomplished through action on draft Metro Ordinance No. 03-1024 adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan. This MTIP must also be determined to be in conformance with the federal Clean Air Act, which would be accomplished through action on draft Metro Resolution No. 03-3382.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to make the transportation projects and programs defined in Exhibit A eligible to receive federal funds to reimburse project costs.
4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step in making eligible federal surface transportation program funds for planning activities performed at Metro. This includes \$730,000 of federal Surface Transportation Program funds to be used for planning activities at Metro in the current fiscal year.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve the resolution as recommended.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ADD FUNDING OF PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING OF THE HIGHWAY 217 WIDENING PROJECT. |) | RESOLUTION NO. 03-3398 |
| |) | |
| |) | Introduced by Councilor Rod Park; JPACT Chair |

WHEREAS, projects selected to receive federal transportation funding must be included in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program for the Portland metropolitan area Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), which reports on the programming of all federal transportation funds to be spent in the region, and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation has proposed beginning preliminary engineering for the widening of Highway 217 northbound to three lanes between the Tualatin Valley (State Highway 10) and Sunset (State Highway 26) highways this fiscal year, and

WHEREAS, this project is consistent with the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan and the Westside Environmental Impact Statement, and

WHEREAS, these proposed programming of these funds in the MTIP must be found in compliance with all relevant federal law and administrative rules, including a demonstration of compliance with the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality, and

WHEREAS, the attached as Exhibit A demonstrates compliance of this project with the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council amends the 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to include the Highway 217 widening project, subject to concurrence from the Federal Highway Administration on the demonstration of compliance with the Oregon State Implementation Plan for air quality.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 11th day of December, 2003

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

**Exhibit A;
Metro Resolution No. 03-3398**

This exhibit serves as the Determination of Conformity to the Oregon State Implementation Plan for air quality for the 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program as amended by Metro Resolution No. 03-3398.

Metro Resolution No. 03-3398 adds programming of \$1,676,000 of federal funding (\$1,867,826 total funding) for preliminary engineering (PE) of RTP Project Number 3001; Highway 217 between Tualatin Valley Highway and Highway 26 – widening to three lanes in north bound direction and interchange ramp work, in federal fiscal year 2004.

This is a non-exempt project for purposes of impact to air quality and therefore must demonstrate compliance with the Oregon State Improvement Plan for air quality prior to obligation of federal funds.

This project is adopted as a part of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan financially constrained system for the Metro area, (as amended by Ordinance 02-946A). Within the financially constrained system, this project was programmed to be operating within the 2006 to 2010 time frame. Therefore, it was included as a built project in the 2010 network (and all subsequent networks) for conformity with air quality rules.

Quantitative conformity analysis of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, approved through Metro Resolution No. 00-2999, received joint Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration approval on January 26, 2001. The qualitative factors of the conformity determination demonstrating planning assumptions and modeling techniques are addressed in the 2000 RTP Air Quality Conformity Determination report. These issues have not significantly changed since adoption of the report. Therefore, no supplemental quantitative analysis of emissions effects of the funding allocation to this project is warranted.

As the amendment of the 2002-05 MTIP to include preliminary engineering for this project is consistent with the construction of this project within the 2006 to 2010 time frame as conformed within the regional transportation plan, and not prior to the 2005 air quality analysis year, also consistent with the plan, this amendment of the MTIP is in conformance with the Oregon State Implementation Plan for air quality.

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3398, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO ADD FUNDING OF PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING OF THE HIGHWAY 217 WIDENING PROJECT.

Date: November 24, 2003

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a report that summarizes all programming of federal transportation funding in the Metro region and demonstrates that the use of these funds will comply with all relevant federal laws and administrative rules. To qualify to receive federal transportation funds, projects must be approved in the MTIP.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has proposed to begin preliminary engineering on the widening of Highway 217 northbound to three lanes between the Tualatin Valley (Oregon Highway 10) and Sunset (Oregon Highway 26) highways this federal fiscal year. While engineering of this project in this time frame is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and the project has completed necessary environmental analysis as a part of the Westside Environmental Impact Statement, it is not currently programmed in the MTIP.

ODOT proposed funding preliminary engineering of this project within its process to review and adopt the 2004-07 State Transportation Implementation Plan. This planning process has met all state and federal requirements for public involvement and has been adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission. Metro has not yet completed its 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. ODOT is interested in beginning preliminary engineering of this project prior to when the US Department of Transportation may recognize the 2004-07 Metropolitan and State Implementation Plans as conforming with air quality regulations. To proceed prior to this federal action, it is necessary to amend the existing 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

As the Highway 217 widening project will add capacity to the motor vehicle system, it must be found that construction of this project is in conformance with the federal Clean Air Act and specifically, the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality. The finding of conformance with the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality is attached as Exhibit A.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** Several antecedents relate to this resolution. This amendment amends the 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, adopted by Metro Resolution No. 02-3178. This resolution programs transportation funds in accordance with the federal transportation authorizing legislation (currently known as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or

TEA-21) and the federal Clean Air Act. This resolution conforms with the Oregon State Implementation Plan for air quality. It is also consistent with the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.

3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to make the Highway 217 transportation project eligible to receive federal funds to reimburse project costs.
4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of this resolution has no anticipated impacts to the Metro budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve the resolution as recommended.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FUNDING OF FIVE PROJECTS; HIGHWAY 43 TURN REFUGES, HIGHWAY 30 SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, UNION STATION IMPROVEMENTS, TUALATIN RIVER BIKE/PED BRIDGE, AND HILLSBORO REGIONAL CENTER PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS. |) | RESOLUTION NO. 03-3399 |
| |) | |
| |) | Introduced by Councilor Rod Park; JPACT Chair |

WHEREAS, projects selected to receive federal transportation funding must be included in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), which reports on the programming of all federal transportation funds to be spent in the region, and

WHEREAS, the Oregon Department of Transportation has proposed beginning five projects within the Metro region this fiscal year, and

WHEREAS, these projects are consistent with the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, and

WHEREAS, these projects are determined to be exempt from findings of compliance with the Oregon State implementation plan for air quality; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council amends the 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to include funding for the following projects:

- Highway 43 turn refuges at intersections from Laurel Street to Glenmorrie Drive,
- Highway 30 pedestrian safety improvements at 105th and 107th Avenues,
- Union Station building repairs,
- Tualatin River bicycle and pedestrian bridge,
- Hillsboro regional center pedestrian improvements.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 11th day of December, 2003

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 03-3399, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2002-05 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FUNDING OF FIVE PROJECTS; HIGHWAY 43 TURN REFUGES, HIGHWAY 30 PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS, UNION STATION IMPROVMENTS, TUALATIN RIVER BIKE/PED BRIDGE, AND HILLSBORO REGIONAL CENTER PEDESTRIAN IMPROVMENTS.

Date: November 24, 2003

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

BACKGROUND

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a report that summarizes all programming of federal transportation funding in the Metro region and demonstrates that the use of these funds will comply with all relevant federal laws and administrative rules. To qualify to receive federal transportation funds, projects must be approved in the MTIP. The MTIP is updated every two years and amended as necessary to reflect current programming of federal transportation funds.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has proposed to begin preliminary engineering on five projects not currently programmed in the MTIP. ODOT is interested in beginning preliminary engineering of these projects prior to when the US Department of Transportation may recognize the upcoming 2004-07 Metropolitan and State Implementation Plans as conforming with air quality regulations. To proceed prior to this federal action, it is necessary to amend the existing 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

Following are brief descriptions of the projects:

Highway 43 Turn Refuges. This project will add turn refuges at intersections of Highway 43 south of downtown Lake Oswego from the intersection of Laurel Street to the intersection of Glenmorrie Drive. The project will be funded through the State safety program in the amount of \$275,800.

Highway 30 Pedestrian Safety. This project will add pedestrian safety elements on Highway 30 in the Linnton area near the intersections of 105th and 107th Avenues. Safety elements will include signal modifications, curb extensions, sidewalks and possibly illumination elements. The project will be funded through the State safety program in the amount of \$550,000.

Union Station Improvements. This project will provide roof, masonry and carpentry repairs to the Union Station building. The project will be funded through the state Transportation Enhancements program in the amount of \$1,155,000.

Tualatin River Pedestrian/Bike Bridge. This project will provide a new pedestrian and bicycle bridge and approach trails across the Tualatin River. The project will be funded through the state Transportation Enhancements program in the amount of \$1,390,000.

Hillsboro Regional Center Pedestrian Improvements. This project will provide sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting and planter strips on several streets in the Hillsboro regional center. The project will be funded through the state Transportation Enhancements program in the amount of \$739,500.

These projects are exempt from a determination of conformity with the Oregon State Implementation Plan for air quality.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** This amendment amends the 2002-05 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, adopted by Metro Resolution No. 02-3178. This resolution programs transportation funds in accordance with the federal transportation authorizing legislation (currently known as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or TEA-21) and the federal Clean Air Act. This resolution is consistent with the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to make these projects eligible to receive federal funds to reimburse project costs.
4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of this resolution has no anticipated impacts to the Metro budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve the resolution as recommended.

1.7 MTIP AMENDMENT PROCESS

This section describes the management process to define the types of project adjustments that require an amendment to the MTIP and which of these that can be accomplished as administrative actions by staff versus policy action by JPACT and the Metro Council.

Objectives of the Process

1. Ensure that federal requirements are properly met for use of available federal funds, including the requirement that projects using federal funds are included in the TIP and that the projects are consistent with the financially constrained element of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
2. Ensure regional consideration of proposed amendments having an impact on the priority for use of limited available resources or having an effect on other parts of the transportation system, other modes of transportation or other jurisdictions.
3. Ensure that the responsibilities for project management and cost control remain with the jurisdiction sponsoring the project.
4. Authorize routine amendments to the MTIP to proceed expeditiously to avoid unnecessary delays and committee activity.
5. Provide for dealing with emergency situations.
6. Ensure projects are progressing to fully obligate annual funding in order to avoid a lapse of funds.

Policies

1. Consistency with the financially constrained element of the RTP – Projects included in the MTIP must be identified in or consistent with the RTP. Questions relating to the need for and scope of a project are answered through inclusion in the RTP; questions relating to the priority of projects within available resources are answered through inclusion in the MTIP. Major projects, particularly projects affecting the capacity of the transportation system, projects that impact other modes and projects impacting other jurisdictions, must be specifically identified in the RTP Financially Constrained system; minor projects such as signals, safety overlays, parts and equipment, etc. must be consistent with the policy intent of the RTP. An amendment to the RTP to add a project can occur concurrent with an MTIP amendment and must follow the process for amending the RTP as outlined in the most current plan (the process for amending the 2000 RTP is contained in Section 6.6 on pages 6-24 through 6-27).

Prior to formal inclusion in the RTP financially constrained system, projects will need a finding of conformance with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality, with concurrence from the Federal Highway Administration – Federal Transit Administration.

2. MTIP Additions – All project additions to the TIP must be at the request of the sponsoring jurisdictions governing body and require adoption of a Metro/JPACT resolution approving a specific new project as a priority for use of a particular category of funds. This action will be based strictly on the amount of federal funding available and represents a priority decision as to the most effective use of the resource.

Exceptions: New projects using the following types of funds or in the following conditions can be administratively added to the MTIP at the option of Metro staff in cases where the proposed improvement does not significantly affect capacity, with monthly notification to TPAC:

- Safety funds; up to \$500,000.
- Bridge replacement funds – up to \$5 million;
- Interstate Maintenance funds for resurfacing/rehabilitation type projects - up to \$5 million;
- Emergency additions where an imminent public safety hazard is involved; and •
Addition of project details to previously approved generic projects such as parts and equipment, signals, street overlays, etc.

An amendment to add a project to the MTIP can occur concurrent with a MTIP amendment to transfer project funds between MTIP projects. To request the addition of a project to the MTIP outside of the periodic Transportation Priorities project selection process, a project sponsor shall meet with the MTIP manager for consultation on the provision of the following information to inform consideration of the MTIP amendment resolution:

- Local and/or regional policy decisions, program changes and other considerations that support the request for the MTIP amendment;
- Proposed project additions meet the preliminary screening criteria and public involvement requirements of the MTIP;
- Project information needed to address technical evaluation measures used for the appropriate project selection criteria such as land use objectives, safety, cost effectiveness, etc. and any qualitative considerations the project sponsor wishes to have considered in the request.

Funding match ratio eligibility will be consistent with federal regulations and policies from the previous Transportation Priorities project selection process.

3. MTIP Amendments – Amendments to the MTIP for previously approved project(s) on the following basis:

- a. Administrative Adjustments (requiring monthly notification to TPAC):
 - Transfer of funds between different phases of a project or different program years within previously approved funding levels.
 - Transfer of funds between projects within previously approved funding levels; must be accompanied by a statement as to the impact on the project relinquishing funds; funding fully transferred from a project to another must include a commitment to fund the project giving up the funds with another source of funds (follow-up documentation will be required); requires monthly report to TPAC.
- b. Adjustments by Metro/JPACT Resolution:
 - Funding transfers to a new MTIP project.
 - Increased allocation of funds in excess of level previously allocated to the jurisdiction.

Transfers between jurisdictions require approval of each affected jurisdiction.