

## STAFF REPORT

### A RESOLUTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE WILSONVILLE TO BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL STUDY

Date: June 30, 2000

Presented by: Ross Roberts

## PROPOSED ACTION

Adopt the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Study Locally Preferred Alternative for the purpose of completing preliminary engineering.

## EXISTING LAW

Metro is a designated MPO and eligible recipient of federal funds. The funds for the Commuter Rail project are Section 5309 Federal New Starts funds for the purpose of engineering rail transit facilities. Washington County has requested that Metro be the grantee for preliminary engineering as they were for the Alternatives Analysis.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In October 1999, Washington County, the cities of Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville, the Oregon Department of Transportation, Tri-Met and Metro initiated Alternatives Analysis and an Environmental Assessment to develop a more diverse and balanced transportation system by providing another transit option for commuters in the Wilsonville to Beaverton corridor. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was the lead federal agency for this study, which analyzed two alternatives to commuter rail, a Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative and a No Build Alternative.

The proposed project would utilize existing freight tracks in the approximately 15-mile corridor, except for approximately 2000 feet of new trackway at the northern terminus of the project near the Beaverton Transit Center. The commuter rail line would operate at 30-minute headways between approximately 5:30 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. Five stations would be constructed at Beaverton, Washington Square/Nimbus, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville. Sixteen round trips would be made daily with 4,650 daily riders forecast for the year 2020.

The study concluded that compared to the No Build and the TSM Alternatives, Commuter Rail would:

- Provide 4,650 average daily ridership as compared to 1,520 for the TSM alternative by the year 2020.
- Provide in-vehicle transit travel time of 26 minutes as compared to 54 minutes for the TSM alternative for a Wilsonville to Beaverton Transit Center trip.
- Provide the most efficient transit links between regional and town centers.

- Best support state, regional and local transportation and land use plans and policies.
- Best support increased opportunities for pedestrian-friendly and transit oriented development.
- Provide a reliable and direct link between population and employment centers in the Corridor.
- Support and encourage continued economic growth.

The Locally Preferred Alternative has been unanimously supported by the City Councils of Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville, and adopted unanimously by the Washington County Board of Commissioners. The adoption of this resolution amends the 1995 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), contingent upon an air quality conformity determination. The Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail line is included in the 2000 RTP Financially Constrained Alternative.

#### BUDGET IMPACT

No budget impact

#### RECOMMENDATION

Adoption of Resolution No. 00-2972BA.

GL:RR:rmb  
C:\resolutions\2000\00-2972BA\_SR.doc

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE )  
LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR )  
THE WILSONVILLE TO BEAVERTON )  
COMMUTER RAIL STUDY )

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2972AB |

Introduced by  
Councilor Jon Kvistad,  
JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, Washington County has sponsored the two initial feasibility studies of commuter rail in the Highway 217 – Interstate 5 Corridor, and

WHEREAS, Washington County led the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Study Alternatives Analysis which examined alternatives to serve the need for transit improvement in the Wilsonville to Beaverton corridor; and

WHEREAS, the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Study concluded that compared to a No-Build and a Transportation System Management (TSM), a Commuter Rail Alternative would:

- Provide 4,650 average daily ridership as compared to 1,520 for the TSM alternative by the year 2020.
- Provide in-vehicle transit travel time of 26 minutes as compared to 54 minutes for the TSM alternative for a Wilsonville to Beaverton Transit Center trip.
- Provide the most efficient transit links between regional and town centers.
- Best support state, regional and local transportation and land use plans and policies.
- Best support increased opportunities for pedestrian-friendly and transit oriented development.
- Provide a reliable and direct link between population and employment centers in the Corridor.
- Support and encourage continued economic growth; and

WHEREAS, the cities of Beaverton, Tigard, Tualatin and Wilsonville have taken formal action supporting Commuter Rail recommending Washington County adopt Commuter Rail as the Locally Preferred Strategy; and,

WHEREAS, commuter rail in the Wilsonville to Beaverton corridor has been identified as a key strategy in the proposed 2000 Update to the Regional Transportation Plan to be adopted in August 2000. Now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, THAT:

1. The Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Study Locally Preferred Alternative is adopted for the purpose of completing preliminary engineering; and
2. The 1995 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan is amended, contingent upon an air quality conformity determination, to include the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail Study Locally Preferred Alternative in the Financially Constrained list of projects.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

---

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, General Council

GL:rmb

C:\resolutions\2000\00-2972BA.doc

## STAFF REPORT

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2978 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR AMENDMENT OF THE 1995 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RESOLUTION NO. 00-2969A) AND THE FY 2000 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RESOLUTION NO. 00-2950) TO INCLUDE THE WILSONVILLE/ BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL PROJECT (REFERENCE RESOLUTION 00-2972B)

Date: June 30, 2000

Presented by: Mike Hoglund

### PROPOSED ACTION

Approval of this resolution would adopt a regional air quality conformity determination for amendment of the FY 2000 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and proposed amendment of the 1995 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to include the Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail project.

### EXISTING LAW

State and federal regulation require that no transportation project may interfere with attainment or maintenance of air quality standards. Preparation of a Conformity Determination is required to demonstrate that significant transportation projects will not cause automotive emissions to exceed emissions budgets established in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for maintenance of air quality standards.

### BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Metro and Washington County, together with several of its cities, have been cooperating in preparation of feasibility analyses and an environmental assessment of commuter rail between Wilsonville and Beaverton, including stops in Tualatin, Tigard and Washington Square. In fall of 1999, Congress appropriated \$500,000 to prepare 30 percent design of the new transit service, including rehabilitation of existing freight track and construction of stations and approximately 2000 feet of new trackway. Resolution No. 00-2950 authorized programming of the appropriated federal funds as an amendment of the FY 2000 program year of the MTIP.

The congressionally funded design phase is intended to lead directly to project construction. This requires that the project be amended into the 1995 RTP financially constrained network. Metro

Resolution No. 00-2972B, recommended for approval by TPAC at the June meeting and currently pending before JPACT, addresses this need.<sup>1</sup>

### **State Air Quality Rule**

State and federal regulations require consideration of the project's relationship to SIP for maintenance of air quality standards and thus, Metro has prepared this Conformity Determination. The Determination quantitative analysis (see Exhibit A of the Resolution) shows that the project's potential effects on regional air quality will be consistent with mobile source emissions budgets established in the SIP for Oxides of Nitrogen, Hydrocarbons (i.e., ozone precursor compounds) and Carbon Monoxide.

### **Interagency Consultation**

Metro staff met with representatives of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and federal highway and transit administration officials pursuant to state regulations for intergovernmental consultation during preparation of determinations. It was agreed that the project would have very restricted effects given its limited hours of operation, its limited geographic extent and anticipated ridership. Therefore, rather than requiring multiple runs of the region's complete four-step travel model to demonstrate conformity, it was agreed that modification of the region's currently approved Determination would meet the Rule requirements for quantitative assessment of air quality effects.

Because of the limited intent of this analysis, FHWA felt it would be highly inappropriate to view this Determination as a full reaffirmation of the 1995 network. From the perspective of federal transportation officials, the region's approved Conformity Determination will continue to be represented by the January 2000 document. Metro fully anticipates that the region's 2000 RTP update will supercede the 1995 network before the end of calendar year 2000, including preparation of a new comprehensive Determination. In the meantime, the region's federally approved transportation system is reflected in the 1995 financially constrained network and the conforming status of that network will not lapse until January 2003.

### **Quantitative Analysis Protocol**

Under the approved protocol, Metro abstracted ridership estimates and vehicle travel and speed characteristics from the modeled network used in the alternatives analysis prepared for FTA project review. This data was developed using full step model runs in 2005 and 2020. The resultant emissions characteristics were then subtracted from the emissions quantified in the Determination that was prepared for the 2000 MTIP and which was reviewed by EPA and jointly approved by FHWA and FTA on January 27, 2000.

### **Qualitative Analysis**

The State Conformity Rule also requires discussion of numerous other issues that are more concerned with the quality of underlying assumptions used in the quantitative analysis,

---

<sup>1</sup> Metro Resoluton No. 00-2969A, pending, approves the 2000 RTP financially constrained network, which includes the project. However, a conformity determination on the new network won't be completed until this fall. Consequently, an amended conformity determination for the amended 1995 network is required.

especially concerning use of most current demographic information and viability of transit system operations and patronage assumptions. The Commuter Rail project makes no substantive alteration of the assumptions used in the January Determination. As with implementation of all rail projects, Tri-Met anticipates reconfiguration of existing bus transit service to feeder service in and around the five new stations. The essential scheme for this reconfiguration was part of the modeled system used for FTA review of the project. Details of the actual implementation will be worked out in the Tri-Met annual service plan updates.

### **Schedule for Adoption**

There has been some urgency attending preparation and adoption of this analysis. It is anticipated that FTA will issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the project. This will clear a hurdle for seeking federal FY 2001 appropriations for the project's final design. The FONSI cannot be issued until the project is found to conform with the SIP and if it is delayed, the region may be unable to secure additional final design funding until FY 2002.

Confounding this schedule, JPACT has cancelled its normal August meeting. Therefore, staff has requested JPACT approval of the Determination in July, although the public comment period has not yet been concluded. Past determinations have garnered comment only from DEQ, which is represented on JPACT. Additionally, the Metro Council will hold a public hearing August 8<sup>th</sup>, two days prior to consideration of the resolution on August 10<sup>th</sup>. Should any significant issues be raised after JPACT consideration, and which cannot be resolved by staff response to the satisfaction of the Metro Council, the resolution can be remanded to JPACT for further consideration. This "contingent" JPACT approval was deemed an adequate safeguard of public involvement interests during interagency discussion of the dilemma posed by cancellation of the August meeting.

TW:rmb

c:\resolutions\2000\00-2978SR.doc

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2978 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ) RESOLUTION NO. 00-2978  
ADOPTING THE PORTLAND AREA AIR QUALITY )  
CONFORMITY DETERMINATION FOR ) Introduced by  
AMENDMENT OF THE 1995 REGIONAL ) Councilor Jon Kvistad,  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RESOLUTION NO. ) JPACT Chair  
00-2969A) AND THE FY 2000 METROPOLITAN )  
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM )  
(RESOLUTION NO. 00-2950) TO INCLUDE THE )  
WILSONVILLE/ BEAVERTON COMMUTER RAIL )  
PROJECT (REFERENCE RESOLUTION 00-2972B) )

WHEREAS, State and federal regulation require that no transportation project may interfere with attainment or maintenance of air quality standards; and

WHEREAS, The proposed Wilsonville/Beaverton Commuter Rail project in Washington County is considered in the State Conformity Rule to be a regionally significant project with respect to its potential effects on regional air quality; and

WHEREAS, funds appropriated by Congress to support 30 percent design for the project have been authorized for obligation in the FY 2000 through 2003 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (Metro Resolution No. 00-2950, approved); and

WHEREAS, The project scope and concept are being amended into the 1995 Regional Transportation Plan (Metro Resolution No. 00-2972B, pending); and

WHEREAS, The project has also been included in the Financially Constrained Network of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan that is proceeding to approval by JPACT and the Metro Council (Metro Resolution No. 00-2969A, pending); and

WHEREAS, The 2000 RTP will be the subject of another Conformity Determination in early fall of 2000; and

WHEREAS, Amendment of the 1995 RTP and the FY 2000 MTIP triggered a need to prepare an Air Quality Conformity Determination, included as Exhibit A of this resolution, demonstrating that the Commuter Rail project conforms with the State Implementation Plan for maintenance of air quality standards; and



WHEREAS, Metro convened the Intergovernmental Consultation sub-committee of TPAC to confirm the technical basis for preparation of the Conformity Determination; and

WHEREAS, The results of this consultation have been presented for consideration by TPAC which is the standing body authorized by the State Air Quality Rule to conduct Interagency Consultation; and

WHEREAS, Notice of availability of the Determination for a 30-day public review and comment period was posted in the July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2000, Sunday Oregonian; and

WHEREAS, Any comments generated during this period of review will be presented to the Metro Council in a hearing prior to its consideration and/or approval of this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Any significant issues necessitating JPACT's reconsideration of the resolution and/or the Conformity Determination can cause the Council to remand the issue for further JPACT consideration; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. The Conformity Determination shown in Exhibit A of the Resolution is approved.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_, day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

---

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

TW:rmb

Attachment: Exhibit A

C:\Resolutions\2000\00-2978.doc



METRO

**Regional Conformity Determination  
for  
Washington County Commuter Rail  
July 12, 2000**

**I. Introduction**

The FY 2000 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) approved allocation of \$1 million to Washington County to prepare the environmental evaluation for the proposed Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail transit project. The County has worked with Metro to prepare this analysis, which is nearing completion. Metro and the County anticipate that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for addition of the proposed service to the region's mix of transportation options.

The FY 2000 federal appropriation process allocated \$500,000 of Section 5309 (New Start) discretionary funds for next phase engineering (30 percent design) to refine the design of the approved project. These additional funds must be amended into the MTIP and the State TIP (STIP) before they can be obligated.

To program the PE funds and to support FTA's expected issuance of a FONSI, the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project must be shown to conform quantitatively and qualitatively with the State (Air Quality) Implementation Plan (SIP). If a conformity finding is delayed, the FONSI cannot be issued and the region's efforts to secure additional federal discretionary funding for preliminary engineering will most likely be delayed to the end of FY 2001. If programming of the \$500,000 is delayed, work on the project will stop, resulting in a loss of momentum for the project and decreased efficiency in concluding project design.

**FINDINGS: Metro's quantitative analysis of the project shows that emission budgets established in the SIP for carbon monoxide (CO), and ozone precursor compounds - measured as hydrocarbons (HC) and Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) - are maintained assuming implementation of the project (see Table 1, below).**

**Commuter rail is also integrated in the region's overall transit service policies as evidenced by several Metro resolutions endorsing both the overall concept of commuter rail in the region and the specific scope and concept of the current project proposal.**

**TABLE 1: EMISSION BUDGETS AND CALCUATED EMISSIONS**

<b>NOx EMISSIONS</b> (rounded to nearest ton)	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>HC Budget</b>	51	51	52	55	59
<b>Project Related Emissions Reductions</b>	-0.0036	-0.0038	-0.0045	-0.0054	-0.0066
<b>Regional Emissions w/ project</b>	51	51	52	55	59

<b>HC EMISSIONS</b> (rounded to nearest ton)	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>HC Budget</b>	42	41	40	40	40
<b>Project Related Emissions Reductions</b>	-0.0028	-0.0029	-0.0033	-0.0038	-0.0045
<b>Regional Emissions w/ project</b>	36	36	36	36	38

<b>CO EMISSIONS</b> (rounded to nearest 000's lbs)	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>Winter CO Budget</b>	979	947	760	788	842
<b>Project Related Emissions Reductions</b>	-0.0662	-0.0719	-0.0909	-0.0945	-0.01133
<b>Regional Emissions w/ project</b>	691	696	704	716	740

**Region's Conformity Status**

Metro prepared a Conformity Determination for the 1995 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the FY 2000 – 2003 MTIP in November 1999. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FTA jointly approved the Determination on January 27, 2000. The Determination is valid for three years unless significant amendment of either the MTIP or RTP is approved in the interim.

Metro Resolution Number 00-2972 (adoption pending) amends the 1995 RTP to include the Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project as part of the 20-year regional transportation system. Metro Resolution No. 00-2950 programs the newly appropriated New Start PE funds in the MTIP. Both actions trigger the need for this Determination. No other regionally significant amendment of the MTIP or RTP has been approved.<sup>1</sup> Metro views this Determination as validation of Commuter Rail against the methodological assumptions approved in the January Conformity Determination and anticipates that the three year validity of the prior Determination will continue to govern the region's conforming status lapse date.

<sup>1</sup> In July 2000, Metro approved a new financially constrained system plan as an element of a revised 2000 RTP. This approval will trigger a need to prepare a new Conformity Determination within six months. This system plan includes contemporary assumptions for Commuter Rail scope and concept. A complete model run was conducted for the new plan's 2020 horizon year. This analysis, which meets the State Rule protocol for emission analysis, shows 2020 budgets for all applicable pollutants would be maintained by the new system, including implementation of commuter rail between Wilsonville and Beaverton. However, the new RTP has not yet received federal approval and a complete conformity determination has not been made. At present, regional conformity is still linked to determinations featuring the 1995 RTP system, as amended.

## **II. Quantitative Methodology**

The proposed project has limited effects on a subarea of the region that contains a number of freeway, state highway, arterial and transit travel pathways. Despite numerous travel options, the corridor faces high travel demand during the commute period and is quite congested. After consultation between the MPO and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, FHWA and FTA it was concluded that statistical modification of the January 2000 Conformity Determination would be sufficient to demonstrate conformity of commuter rail emissions effects with the SIP. Therefore, rather than running the complete four step model (i.e., trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice and route assignment) this analysis adjusts the output of the four step model process generated in the January 2000 Determination. The prior Determination was prepared to conform the FY 00 MTIP, and also addressed the modified the scope and concept of the Interstate MAX extension project in the RTP.

To make the adjustments and account for the project, transit mode shift estimates developed by Metro for FTA project evaluation were used to modify regional emissions estimates developed in the January Determination. A detailed example of this methodology – in the context of the 2020 analysis year – is included in Appendix 1. An overview of the methodology is provided below with emphasis on those elements agreed to during interagency consultation.

### **Description of the Project**

The project entails refurbishing approximately 14 miles of active freight rail tracks to accommodate dual operation of commuter rail during the three hour a.m. and p.m. peak periods (e.g., 6-9 a.m. and 4-7 p.m.). Four self-propelled diesel multiple unit (DMV) rail cars would be purchased and operate between Wilsonville and Downtown Beaverton, with stops also at Tualatin, Tigard and Washington Square. A total of 12 northbound and 12 southbound trips would be completed daily at half-hour headways. Approximately 2,000 feet of new trackway would be needed in Beaverton. No other revision of the regional road network has been approved by Metro.

### **FTA NEPA Analysis**

Regional emissions effects of the project are linked to estimated ridership. This Determination quantitative analysis draws ridership estimates from the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared by Metro staff for FTA's evaluation of the project. Estimates were developed by modification of the full demand model used to predict Interstate MAX ridership in the previous approved Conformity Determination. That system was modified to include Washington County Commuter Rail. Metro estimates 2,410 daily commuter rail trips in 2005 and 4,650 trips in 2020. Approximately half of the trips in each year represent new transit trips. The balance represents mode shift from bus transit. Ridership in interim analysis years was estimated as a straight-line interpolation of these two estimates.

### **1999 Conformity Network**

The 1999 Determination did not include commuter rail as a travel option. Therefore, the regional emissions calculated to result from the analysis year travel networks reflect more auto

trips than would occur with commuter rail. These emissions were calculated using data from the Environmental Assessment analysis and were deducted from the regional emissions predicted in the January Conformity Determination analysis years. The EA analysis supplied two critical data elements in this calculation.

First, the EA analysis identified the trips attracted to and from the zone pairs served by the new rail service. Of the 1,260 zones in the regional model, a small subset represent the zones from which demand for the new commuter rail service is derived, e.g., zones encompassing travel demand to and from Wilsonville to Beaverton, Tigard/Washington Square, Washington Square/Beaverton, etc. (see Figure 1). Of the total trips served by commuter rail, about half represent new transit trips in all analysis years. The trip distances between each origin/destination pair newly served by transit were summed to provide the total reduction of vehicle miles traveled (vmt) attributable to the project (e.g., 18,705 vmt saved in 2020).

Second, the EA analysis provided the average auto speed between each distinct origin/destination pair. Speeds between each origin/destination pair, weighted to reflect high vehicle hours traveled on dominant routes versus minor ones, were summed and then averaged. This single average speed (22.3 mph) and the sum of all vmt eliminated by the shift of auto trips to commuter rail were used to calculate emissions reductions attributable to the project. Emission factors were drawn from those approved by DEQ for use in the November Determination. The reductions were then applied to total regional emissions calculated to occur in the January Conformity Determination analysis years of 2005, 2015 and 2020. Emissions in interim analysis years are interpolated (i.e., 2006, 2007 and 2010).

Approximately one-third of all commuter rail trips originate as park and ride auto trips, which, while representing reductions of auto trip length, still entail cold starts, some travel, and evaporative losses after each trip end. These factors were taken into consideration in the emissions analysis. As already shown in Table 1, above, slight reductions of emissions resulted for all analyzed pollutants in all analysis years.

### **Reassignment of Travel Demand**

The methodology described above omits one step of a routine regional model run which is the reassignment of trip demand in the corridors effected by the commuter rail project. Commuters converting from auto to commuter rail “free up” road and freeway capacity. In a complete model run, the entirety of trip demand would be reassigned into this newly available road capacity based on most direct/least-time travel routes. The effect of this reassignment is that a small number of trips would avail themselves of more direct, less congested pathways, with reduced delay, slightly increased speed and less vmt. Though very marginal, the more rigorous analysis would be expected to result in slightly greater emissions **reductions** than reported in this Determination.

Regarding “induced” or “latent” demand, the model accommodates all predicted travel demand resulting from the underlying population and employment assumptions. The model does not assume that trip-making is deferred once some preset congestion level is achieved. Therefore, elimination of some auto-system congestion due to conversion of auto trips to transit trips does

not cause the model to draw new trip demand from some reservoir of unmet "latent" demand. As described above, stipulation of "new capacity" only causes the model to reassign total computed travel demand to more efficient routes.<sup>2</sup>

### **Budget Years and Calculated Emissions**

The State Rule calls for calculation of regional emissions ten years from the base year of the emissions model, at intervals thereafter no greater than ten years apart, and at the horizon year of the regional plan. A 20-year horizon to the analysis was stipulated during interagency consultation. Budget years between analysis years may be interpolated. The region's model base year is 1994. The first analysis year of 2005 was selected because it is the start date anticipated for commuter rail and the Interstate MAX extension projects. Emissions calculated in the PDX Light Rail Conformity Determination (approved Oct. 1998) showed the region meeting established budgets in 2003. No transportation projects are expected to come online until 2005 that would change regional emissions calculated in the PDX analysis.

The second analysis year of 2015 is ten years after 2005 and is a budget year for NOx, Hydrocarbons and Carbon Monoxide. The third analysis year of 2020 extends five years beyond the horizon of the 1995 RTP. The January Determination extrapolated an additional five years of population and employment, by zone, and assigned resultant travel demand over a static 2015 regional roadway network, and a redistributed transit network reflecting the region's commitment of 0.5 percent annual transit service increases. Key assumptions guiding deployment of the added increment of transit service was increased service to outlying urban reserve locations expected to begin significant buildout after 2015 and redeployment of line haul service to feeder route service around light rail radial routes and the Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail alignment.

Emissions for interim budget years: 2006 (ozone precursors), 2007 (CO) and 2010 (ozone and CO) were interpolated as permitted by the rule.

### **III. Qualitative Analysis**

Virtually all elements of the January qualitative analysis remain valid at this time. The regional endorsement of Commuter Rail reflected in this programming action has been preceded by several years of investigation and consideration by the region's transportation technical and policy bodies. In May 1997, Metro approved Resolution No. 97-2507 which concluded that Commuter Rail was not an appropriate cost cutting measure appropriate for consideration in the South/North Corridor and suggested that portions of Washington County might be more suitable for this travel mode. A feasibility study, (financed jointly by Washington County, several cities in the County and ODOT), was conducted and in 1998. On the basis of this study Metro approved Resolution No. 98-2692 allocating partial financing for a Commuter Rail Demonstration run. In 1999, Metro Resolution 99-2878B was approved, adopting a Strategic Transportation System Plan (responding to State land use and transportation planning

---

<sup>2</sup> There are some other rather arcane changes in both routing and distribution of travel demand that are possible, given a large enough change in system speeds. Speed changes resulting from implementation of the commuter rail project though, were negligible and these issues are irrelevant to the analysis.

requirements) that included commuter rail. Also in 1999, Metro Resolution 99-2830 approved adoption of the FY 00 – 03 MTIP/STIP which allocated \$1.0 of regional flexible federal funding for a Washington County Commuter Rail NEPA analysis.

Three additional resolutions provide further endorsement of the project. Resolution 00-2950 amended the MTIP to program the \$500,000 of PE funding appropriated to the project by Congress. The second, Metro Resolution No. 00-2972B (pending), approves the Commuter Rail locally preferred alternative and amends the 1995 RTP to include the project scope and concept into the regional transportation system plan. Finally, Resolution No. 00-2969A (pending), adopts the 2000 RTP including a financially constrained regional transportation system plan that includes the Commuter Rail project and all other federally required elements.

#### **IV. Interagency Consultation and Public Outreach Process**

Before preparation of this Determination, Metro convened the Interagency Consultation subcommittee of TPAC on June 30, 2000 to discuss the appropriate analysis protocol and other qualitative issues. The following agreements were concluded:

- Metro would determine quantitative conformity of the project using the methodology described above.
- Metro would continue to provide a 30-day comment period on the draft Determination pursuant to the Metro Public Involvement Guidelines. The comment period will last from the date of publication of the Oregonian notice on Sunday, July 9<sup>th</sup> until closure of the public hearing scheduled before the Metro Council Transportation Committee on Tuesday, August 8.
- TPAC, the entity formally identified as the standing Interagency Consultative body in the State Rule, was briefed on the subcommittee agreements at its June 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- JPACT is the Metro body recognized as the region's MPO by FHWA and FTA. JPACT will approve the Determination at its regular July 13 meeting contingent on a finding by the Metro Council, upon conclusion of the public comment process, that any substantive comments that may be received thereafter are adequately addressed by staff prior to Council approval of the Determination on August 10.
- Should comments be received that require substantive revision of the Determination as approved by JPACT, the Council shall return the Determination to JPACT for further consideration. In light of JPACT's cancellation of the August meeting, a quorum will be convened either at Metro Headquarters, or by teleconference to consider amendments and to act on the revised Determination.
- Assuming federal approval of the Determination, the region's three-year conforming status shall not begin again, but shall instead continue to run from the January 27, 2000 approval of the Determination jointly approved by FHWA and FTA for adoption of the FY 2000 – 2003 MTIP update.

## **V. Conclusion**

The Wilsonville to Beaverton Commuter Rail project will increase transit ridership in a rapidly growing and congested portion of the region. It will cause a reduction of auto trip making in the most heavily congested peak periods. It will reduce regional VMT and associated automotive emissions. Metro's quantitative analysis of the 1995 regional transportation system plan, as amended to include the project, shows that applicable emissions budgets will be maintained if the project is built. A revised RTP, which already contains the project, and for which a complete end-year emissions analysis was conducted, validates this conclusion. A complete determination for this newly adopted plan will be prepared over the next several months.

The region's transportation technical and policy bodies have approved numerous resolutions concerning the project. These actions have addressed the specific consistency of commuter rail with Metro's region-wide commitment to provide balanced transportation options. Project effects on the region's bus service will follow the pattern established for similar extension of light rail in the region: where duplication occurs, radial bus service will be re-deployed as feeder service in order to support the new rail-based line services. All other qualitative aspects of the January Determination remain valid at this time. As with the quantitative analysis, a robust update of the qualitative analysis of the region's transportation system plan will be prepared for the 2000 RTP Determination, later this year.

TW:rmb

C:\Resolutions\2000\00-2978 Exhibit A.doc



## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 00-869A FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN; AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 96-647C AND ORDINANCE NO. 97-715B

Date: June 29, 2000

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

## PROPOSED ACTION

This ordinance would adopt the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as the regional functional plan for transportation, as required by ORS 268.390, and would bring the RTP into compliance with the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The 2000 RTP includes:

- RTP Policies - Chapter 1 of the RTP was initially approved by Council resolution in July 1996. It has since been updated for consistency with the Regional Framework Plan and the functional plan, and edited for readability and brevity. This action will also amend Ordinance No. 97-715B, replacing Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan with the update Chapter 1 of the RTP.
- RTP Projects and Systems Analysis - Chapters 2 through 5 of the RTP identify 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. Chapter 5 includes a description of the strategic system, which is intended to satisfy the state TPR requirements for an "adequate" system, as well as procedures and criteria in Chapter 6 for amending the projects.
- RTP Implementation - 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. These future studies are consistent with state TPR provisions that require refinement planning in areas where a transportation need exists, but further analysis is required to define specific solutions.

## EXISTING LAW

The current federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> century (TEA-21) requires an updated federal plan every three years that demonstrates continued compliance with the fifteen federal planning factors, a financially constrained plan and compliance with the Clean Air Act.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The RTP update has been conducted in three stages over the past four years. The first stage involved an update to the RTP policies that focused on implementing the 2040 Growth Concept, and reflected new state and federal planning requirements. The policy document was approved by Council resolution in July 1996, and has served as the guiding vision for later steps in the update process.

The second stage of the RTP update, known as the RTP alternatives analysis, examined the region's level of service policy for motor vehicles and transit. This stage led to the 2040-based congestion policy that has since been adopted as part of Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The lessons learned from RTP alternatives analysis helped guide the final, project development stage of the RTP update. The project development phase included a system analysis, proposed 20-year transportation solutions, and financial strategies for implementing the plan. This element of the plan, together with the RTP policies approved by resolution in July 1996 and transportation elements of the Regional Framework Plan and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) in 1998, completes the effort to update the RTP to implement the 2040 growth concept.

The RTP update featured a greatly expanded public outreach effort. The update was guided by a 21-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and included several public outreach efforts, special newsletters, and a number of joint JPACT, MPAC and Council workshops held at key decision points. The update also reflects the efforts of local officials, citizens and staff to develop transportation proposals that reflect the policy direction developed by the CAC and regional growth management policies. Of the nearly 700 projects proposed through the year 2020 to address expected growth, and to implement the 2040 growth concept, more than half are new to the regional plan, and many were generated by citizen input. These projects range from relatively modest bicycle and pedestrian improvements to major transit and highway projects, each developed with an eye toward promoting safety, responding to growth or leveraging the 2040 growth concept.

During the past year, staff tested these projects through four separate rounds of transportation modeling. Each project proposed in the 2000 RTP was reflected in the modeling assumptions, and projects were further refined after each round of modeling to better respond to projected travel needs during the 20-year plan period. This phase of the RTP update was also based on a collaborative approach, with local jurisdictions overseeing the modeling process at every step, and modeling analysis completed in a series of workshops with the regional partners. As a result, the draft project list is a consensus-based product, with project recommendations that are based on detailed analysis.

In December 1999, JPACT and the Metro Council approved the draft 1999 RTP by resolution, with direction to staff to complete a final set of analyses prior to adoption of the plan by ordinance. The December 1999 draft is included in Exhibit "A." During the past five months, staff completed the following activities necessary to demonstrate compliance with regional, state and federal planning requirements:

- development, modeling and analysis of the financially constrained network
- preliminary air quality conformity findings
- completion of an off-peak congestion analysis
- findings that demonstrate compliance with state TPR requirements
- findings that demonstrate compliance with federal TEA-21 planning requirements
- draft revisions to the Regional Framework Plan to maintain consistency between RTP and RFP policies
- draft revisions to Title 2 of the UGMFP, as required by the state TPR

The results of these tasks are included in the May 15, 2000 Supplemental Revisions document, which is included as ~~part of~~ Exhibit "AB." A final 45-day public comment period was held from May 15 through June 29, 2000. JPACT recommendations on public comments received during that time period are included in Exhibit "C." Draft revisions to Title 2 and Title 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan are included in Exhibit "D." Findings of compliance with state TPR requirements are shown in Exhibit "BE."

#### BUDGET IMPACT

None.

TK:rmb

C:\Resolutions\2000\00-869A SR.doc

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE )  
2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION )  
PLAN; AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. )  
96-647C AND ORDINANCE NO. 97-715B )

ORDINANCE NO. 00-869A

Introduced by Councilor Kvistad

WHEREAS, Metro's 1989 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), the 1992 RTP Update and this 2000 RTP Update are being adopted as the regional functional plan for transportation under ORS 268.390 and the regional "metropolitan transportation plan" required by federal law as the basis for coordinating federal transportation expenditures superceding the Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan adopted by resolution in 1995; and

WHEREAS, new federal requirements under ISTEA resulted in adoption of a separate federal plan entitled "Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan," July 1995 in Resolution No. 95-2138A, which is now updated in 2000 RTP Update and adopted as Resolution No. 00-2969A; and

~~WHEREAS, the current federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> century ("TEA-21") requires an updated federal plan every three years that demonstrates continued compliance with the fifteen federal planning factors, a "financially constrained" plan and compliance with the Clean Air Act; and~~

WHEREAS, this 2000 RTP Update, adopted by Ordinance, together with portions of the 1996 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan are intended to serve as the regional Transportation System Plan ("TSP") required by the state Transportation Planning Rule; and

WHEREAS, the regional TSP which must be consistent with the state Transportation Systems Plan, including the 1992 Oregon Transportation Plan and the 1999 Oregon Highway Plan; and

WHEREAS, all functional plans, including this 2000 RTP Update, must implement applicable regional goals and objectives, including Metro's acknowledged 2040 Growth Concept; and

WHEREAS, the 2000 RTP Update is adopted herein as a component of the 1997 Regional Framework Plan ; and

WHEREAS, development of this 2000 RTP Update has included adoption of regional transportation policies to begin implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept in Resolution 96-2327, Title 6 requirements for changes to local transportation plans in the 1996 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and inclusion of regional transportation policies in the 1997 Regional Framework Plan; and

~~WHEREAS, a final public comment draft of the 1999 RTP Update, adopted by resolution, was distributed in October, 1999 with seven subregional area summaries of policies and projects affecting local areas ; and~~

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has received ~~the~~ and considered the advice of a 21-member Citizens Advisory Committee, its Metro Policy Advisory Committee, and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, and all the policies and projects have been the subject of extensive public reviews; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 99-2878B stated the process for ~~its~~ refinement and implementation ~~accepted of the final November 5, 1999~~ December 16, 1999; draft of the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan as amended, to be adopted by ordinance with final changes as the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan for federal, state, and regional functional plan purposes; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 6 of this 2000 RTP has been significantly amended based on further analysis and demonstration of compliance with the state Transportation Planning Rule prior to adoption of this 2000 RTP Update by Ordinance ; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 1 of the 2000 RTP containing RTP policies was initially approved by Council resolution in July 1996, ~~and updated in 1999 for consistency with the 1997 Regional Framework Plan, and revised in this Ordinance to replace policy provisions of Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan;~~ and

WHEREAS, Chapters 2 and 5 of the 2000 RTP identify the 20-year transportation needs of 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; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP establishes regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements and establishes ~~any~~ regional TSP and functional plan requirements for city and county comprehensive plans and local TSPs to comply with the 2000 RTP; and

WHEREAS, the ~~congestion and street connection policies~~ requirements adopted in Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to implement Metro's acknowledged 2040 Growth Concept are now included in the 2000 RTP as the primary transportation functional plan with the same compliance timelines as originally adopted; and

WHEREAS, regulatory issues have been addressed before final adoption of the RTP by ordinance, including findings of compliance with the state Transportation Planning Rule, federal planning requirements in TEA-21, development of the "financially constrained" system for purposes of federal air quality conformity; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "A" of this ordinance contains ~~the 2000 RTP in the form of the final 1999 draft adopted by resolution and the 2000 addenda of revisions;~~ and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "B" of this ordinance contains the May 15, 2000 Supplemental Revisions to Exhibit "A;" and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "C" of this ordinance contains the July 13, 2000 JPACT recommendations on public comments received during the final 45-day public comment period; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "D" of this ordinance contains the amended Titles 2 and 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "BE" contains the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law which explain the factual basis for the Plan and include governmental coordination findings and required by the court to comply with statewide planning Goal 2 and in *Parklane et al v. Metro*; and

WHEREAS, the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Appendix of documents and other supporting documents have been included in the decision record before the Metro Council; now, therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The 2000 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), includes the December 16, 1999 RTP, -attached as Exhibit "A," the May 15, 2000 Supplemental Revisions, attached as Exhibit "B" and the July 13, 2000 JPACT Recommendations, attached as Exhibit "C", is incorporated by reference herein is-and hereby adopted as Metro's regional transportation functional plan under ORS 268.390(2),-and

Section 2. The 2000 RTP together with amended Titles 2 and 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, attached as Exhibit "D," is hereby adopted as the

Regional Transportation System Plan under the Transportation Planning Rule at OAR 660-012-010.

Section ~~23~~. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Exhibit “BE” attached and incorporated herein are hereby adopted as explanation of the factual basis for the 2000 RTP governmental coordination findings for the Plan and findings required by the Transportation Planning Rule.

Section ~~34~~. Ordinance No. 97-715B is amended to replace Policies 2.1 through 2.30, Regional Systems Maps, Background and Analysis provisions in Chapter 2 with the Introduction and Sections 1.0 through 1.37 of add the 2000 RTP, which becomes the revised Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan to the Regional Framework Plan as the transportation component.

Section 5. Ordinance No. 97-715B is further amended to include the 2000 RTP in the Regional Framework Plan Appendix to implement Chapter 2 of the Regional Framework Plan.

Section ~~46~~. Ordinance No. 96-647C is hereby amended to remove Title 6 from the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. The compliance timelines and the extensions of Title 8 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan shall continue to apply to these functional plan requirements, and amend Title 2 as shown in Exhibit “C” attached and incorporated herein.

Section 7. Ordinance No. 96-647C is hereby amended to revise Titles 2 and 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan as shown in Exhibit “D” attached and incorporated herein.

Section ~~58~~. The 2000 RTP in Exhibits “A, “B”, “C” and “D.” to be considered together with Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan as amended in this ordinance, shall be transmitted to the Land Conservation and Development Commission for



initial acknowledgment of ~~compliance with the statewide planning goals~~ as the transportation component of the Regional Framework Plan for compliance with the statewide planning goals consistent with ORS 197.274(1)(a).

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

C:\Resolutions\2000\00-869A.doc rmb

:\R-O\2000RTPOrd\001.doc  
OGC\LSS\kvw (06/20/2000)

**Exhibit A  
to Ordinance No. 00-869A**

Submitted as a placeholder for the completed  
2000 Regional Transportation Plan  
are the

**December 16, 1999  
Adoption Draft**

Submitted as a placeholder

**May 15, 2000  
Supplemental Revisions**

Submitted as a placeholder

**Exhibit C, the July 13, 2000, JPACT Recommendations  
On Public Comments Received  
During the Final 45-Day Public Comment Period**

Submitted as a placeholder

**Amended Titles 2 and 10  
of the  
Urban Growth Management Functional Plan**

**Exhibit E, the findings of compliance with the federal planning requirements  
in TEA-21, will be submitted in July 2000.**

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 00-2969A FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS THE FEDERAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: June 29, 2000

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

## PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would adopt the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan, as required by the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. The 2000 RTP includes:

- RTP Policies - Chapter 1 of the RTP was initially approved by Council Resolution in July 1996. It has since been updated for consistency with the Regional Framework Plan and the functional plan, and edited for readability and brevity.
- RTP Projects and Systems Analysis - Chapters 2 through 5 of the RTP identify 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. Chapter 5 includes a description of the financially constrained system, which is required for federal certification, and serves as the basis for a conformity determination with the federal Clean Air Act.
- RTP Implementation - 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.

## EXISTING LAW

The current federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> century (TEA-21) requires an updated federal plan every three years that demonstrates continued compliance with the fifteen federal planning factors, a financially constrained plan and compliance with the Clean Air Act.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The RTP update has been conducted in three stages over the past four years. The first stage involved an update to the RTP policies that focused on implementing the 2040 Growth Concept, and reflected new state and federal planning requirements. The policy document was approved by Council resolution in July 1996, and has served as the guiding vision for later steps in the update process.

The second stage of the RTP update, known as the RTP alternatives analysis, examined the region's level of service policy for motor vehicles and transit. This stage led to the 2040-based congestion policy that has since been adopted as part of Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The lessons learned from RTP alternatives analysis helped guide the final, project development stage of the RTP update. The project development phase included a system analysis, proposed 20-year transportation solutions, and financial strategies for implementing the plan. This element of the plan, together with the RTP policies approved by resolution in July 1996 and transportation elements of the Regional Framework Plan and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) in 1998, completes the effort to update the RTP to implement the 2040 growth concept.

The RTP update featured a greatly expanded public outreach effort. The update was guided by a 21-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and included several public outreach efforts, special newsletters, and a number of joint JPACT, MPAC and Council workshops held at key decision points. The update also reflects the efforts of local officials, citizens and staff to develop transportation proposals that reflect the policy direction developed by the CAC and regional growth management policies. Of the nearly 700 projects proposed through the year 2020 to address expected growth, and to implement the 2040 growth concept, more than half are new to the regional plan, and many were generated by citizen input. These projects range from relatively modest bicycle and pedestrian improvements, to major transit and highway projects, each developed with an eye toward promoting safety, responding to growth or leveraging the 2040 growth concept.

During the past year, staff tested these projects through four separate rounds of transportation modeling. Each project proposed in the 2000 RTP was reflected in the modeling assumptions, and projects were further refined after each round of modeling to better respond to projected travel needs during the 20-year plan period. This phase of the RTP update was also based on a collaborative approach, with local jurisdictions overseeing the modeling process at every step, and modeling analysis completed in a series of workshops with the regional partners. As a result, the draft project list is a consensus-based product, with project recommendations that are based on detailed analysis.

In December 1999, JPACT and the Metro Council approved the draft 1999 RTP by resolution, with direction to staff to complete a final set of analyses prior to adoption of the plan by ordinance. The December 1999 draft is included in Exhibit "A" to this resolution. During the past five months, staff completed the following activities necessary to demonstrate compliance with regional, state and federal planning requirements:

- development, modeling and analysis of the financially constrained network
- preliminary air quality conformity findings
- completion of an off-peak congestion analysis
- findings that demonstrate compliance with state TPR requirements
- findings that demonstrate compliance with federal TEA-21 planning requirements



- draft revisions to the Regional Framework Plan to maintain consistency between RTP and RFP policies
- draft revisions to Title 2 of the UGMFP, as required by the state TPR

The results of these tasks are included in the May 15, 2000 Supplemental Revisions document, which ~~are~~ is also included in Exhibit "A.B." A final 45-day public comment period was held from May 15 through June 29, 2000. JPACT recommendations on public comments received during that time period are included in Exhibit "C." -Upon final adoption of the RTP, staff will conduct a final round of modeling and analysis to demonstrate conformity with the federal Clean Air Act. Exhibit "D" describes the elements of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan for which findings of compliance with federal planning requirements will be made. These findings will be presented to JPACT and the Council in early fall 2000, and recommended for adoption by a separate resolution as part of the federal certification process.

### BUDGET IMPACT

None.

TK:rmb

C:\Resolutions\2000\00-2969A\_SR.doc

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE )  
2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION )  
PLAN AS THE FEDERAL )  
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION )  
PLAN )

RESOLUTION NO. 00-2969A |

Introduced by Councilor Kvistad

WHEREAS, Metro's 1989 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), the 1992 RTP Update and this 2000 RTP Update are being adopted as the regional functional plan for transportation under ORS 268.390 and the regional "metropolitan transportation plan" required by federal law as the basis for coordinating federal transportation expenditures; and

WHEREAS, new federal requirements under ISTEA resulted in a separate federal plan entitled "Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan," July 1995, which is now superceded by this 2000 RTP Update; and

WHEREAS, the current federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> century ("TEA-21") requires an updated federal plan every three years that demonstrates continued compliance with the ~~fifteen~~ seven federal planning factors, a "financially constrained" plan and compliance with the Clean Air Act; and

~~WHEREAS, a final public comment draft of the 1999 RTP Update, adopted by resolution, was distributed in October, 1999 with seven subregional area summaries of policies and projects affecting local areas ; and~~

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has received ~~the~~ and considered the advice of a 21-member Citizens Advisory Committee, its Metro Policy Advisory Committee, and Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, and all the policies and projects have been the subject of extensive public reviews; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 99-2878B stated the process for ~~its~~ refinement and implementation and ~~accepted the final of the November 5~~ December 16, 1999, draft of the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan as amended, to be adopted by ordinance with final changes as the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan for federal, state, and regional functional plan purposes; and

WHEREAS, regulatory issues have been addressed before final adoption of the 2000 RTP by ordinance ~~resolution~~, including findings of compliance with the federal planning requirements in TEA-21, development of the “financially constrained” system for purposes of federal air quality conformity; and

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

WHEREAS, the 2000 RTP is adopted the “metropolitan transportation plan” under TEA-21, superceding the Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan adopted by resolution in 1995; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit “A” of this ~~ordinance~~ resolution contains ~~the RTP in the form of the final 1999 draft adopted by resolution and the 2000 addenda of revisions; and~~

WHEREAS, Exhibit “B” of this resolution contains the May 15, 2000 Supplemental Revisions to Exhibit “A;” and

WHEREAS, Exhibit “C” of this resolution contains the July 13, 2000 JPACT recommendations on public comments received during the final 45-day public comment period; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit “D” of this resolution contains the findings of compliance with the federal planning requirements in TEA-21; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 95-2138A entitled the "Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan." adopted July 1995 will be repealed upon federal approval of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan and the air quality conformity determination for the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Appendix of documents and other supporting documents have been included in the record; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the elements of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (Exhibits "RTPA," "B," and "C") identified in the findings of compliance with federal planning requirements (Exhibit "D"), attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated by reference herein is-are hereby adopted as Metro's "metropolitan transportation plan" under the federal TEA-21, contingent upon demonstration of conformity of the 2000 RTP with the federal Clean Air Act in a subsequent resolution.

2. That the findings of compliance with the federal planning requirements in TEA-21 attached as Exhibit "BD" are hereby adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

~~3. That Resolution No. 95-2138A entitled the "Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan," adopted July 1995 is hereby repealed because the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan supersedes that interim plan.~~

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

---

David Bragdon, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

C:\resolutions\2000\00-2969A.doc rmb

I:\R-O\2000\FedRTP.Res.doc  
OGC/LSS/kvw (06/20/2000)

Submitted as a placeholder for the completed  
2000 Regional Transportation Plan  
is the

**December 16, 1999  
Adoption Draft**

Submitted as a placeholder

**May 15, 2000  
Supplemental Revisions**

Submitted as a placeholder

**Exhibit C, the July 13, 2000, JPACT Recommendations  
On Public Comments Received  
During the Final 45-Day Public Comment Period**



Submitted as a placeholder

**Exhibit D, the findings of compliance with the federal planning requirements  
in TEA-21, will be submitted in July 2000.**

**TPAC Recommendations  
for Revisions to the Draft RTP**  
**Proposed Discussion Items**  
*(with Comment 3 response corrections in italics)*

**Comment 1:** The urban growth boundary along the southern edge of Sherwood should not be expanded until the I-5 to 99W connector is studied, and a general alignment or no-build decision has been made. (Tom Aufenthie, 6/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 1:** Agree, however, this issue is most appropriately addressed as part of the ongoing urban growth boundary discussion. The RTP has recommended a corridor refinement study for the Tualatin-Sherwood connector that considers a “southern” alignment along the south edge of Sherwood. The RTP also requires that the refinement plan consider opportunities for a southern alignment of the connector to serve as a “hard edge” to the urban area, forming a long-term boundary between urban and rural uses. As such, TPAC recommends that this potential for a combined land use and transportation analysis be considered as part of upcoming urban growth boundary expansion deliberations, and that expansion in this area be linked to the completion of the Tualatin-Sherwood connector study. To better frame this issue within the RTP, TPAC recommends the following revisions to the I-5/99W Connector corridor study description on page 6-28 of the draft RTP:

“...This connection will have significant effects on urban form in the this rapidly growing area, and the following design considerations should be addressed in a corridor plan:

- link UGB expansion in this area to the corridor plan, and examine the potential for the proposed highway to serve a “hard edge” in the ultimate urban form of the Sherwood area.”

**Comment 2:** Allow greater public outreach on the LOS policy, 2040 land use implications and RTP finance, and delay adoption of the RTP by six months to accomplish this. (Westside Economic Alliance, 6/28/00; Washington County, 6/29/00; Westside Business Coalition on Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 2:** The comments from the Washington County business groups represent an opportunity to further engage the public in a discussion of the region’s transportation policies and projects. Therefore, TPAC recommends a post-adoption activity be initiated to address the following concerns, as set forth in the comments from the Westside Business Coalition:

1. Develop a more thorough impact analysis of the RTP on the region’s economy that assess the impact of congestion on commerce activities.

2. Evaluate the 2040 Growth Concept in light of the apparent inability to afford infrastructure that makes 2040 work.
3. Engage local jurisdictions, communities and businesses in additional discussion on the consequences of the RTP, including decisions regarding the plan's design, funding and implementation.
4. Postpone any consideration of requesting a regional gas tax/vehicle registration increase of the region's voters during the six-month period.

TPAC recommends that these tasks be addressed in the spirit of implementing the RTP, and that any recommendations or subsequent refinements to the RTP be promptly incorporated into the plan. TPAC recommends that a specific timeline for completing this additional analysis and outreach be developed in conjunction with the business community as part of the expanded outreach effort.

However, the 2000 RTP is the culmination of a five-year update that has been based on an expansive public outreach effort, and should be adopted to provide a clear statement of proposed transportation policy direction.

**Comment 3:** The financially constrained system should be elevated to a more prominent role in the body of the RTP, since it serves as the federally-recognized system for the purpose of federal transportation planning, air-quality and funding requirements (FHWA, 5/23/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 3:** Amendment recommended. To better clarify the relationship between, and corresponding roles the financially constrained and strategic systems, TPAC recommends revising the Preface and Introduction sections of the draft RTP, as shown in Attachment 'B'. TPAC also recommends replacing the "Existing Resource System" section in Chapter 5 of the draft RTP with the "Financially Constrained System" text shown in Attachment 'B'. In addition, TPAC recommends updating the projects maps in Chapter 5 to portray both the financially constrained and strategic systems.

Because of the importance in communicating these systems to the public, TPAC recommends that communication tools be developed following adoption of the plan. Metro has proposed a "magazine" synopsis of the plan, and TPAC recommends that this synopsis be developed as a *detailed summary of the plan that offers both brevity and essential information about the 2000 RTP.*



## CITY of BEAVERTON

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

**ROB DRAKE**  
**MAYOR**

July 12, 2000

Mr. John Kvistad, Chair  
JPACT  
Metro Council  
600 NE Grand Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Chairman Kvistad:

This letter is in response to a vote taken by the Washington County Coordinating Committee (WCCC) on July 10. WCCC unanimously supported requesting that JPACT and the Metro Council delay adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for six months.

WCCC understands that the RTP has already received considerable review and comment. However, the attached comments from the Westside Business Coalition on Transportation outline the concerns being expressed by the Washington County business community and citizen leaders. Such major employers as Fred Meyer, Intel, Nike, Tektronix and Portland General Electric have joined a coalition of business interests in expressing concerns about the implications of implementing the RTP as currently proposed. Such issues as unacceptable levels of traffic congestion and inadequately funded infrastructure concern the coalition.

The coalition requests that Metro postpone its decision for six months and conduct an effort of more specific evaluation of the RTP's impact on the economy, 2040 Growth Concept transportation infrastructure needs and other specific actions as outlined in the attached document. The RTP is a powerful and influential document that needs careful consideration before final adoption.

Sincerely,

Rob Drake  
Vice Chair, WCCC  
Mayor of Beaverton



# WESTSIDE BUSINESS COALITION ON TRANSPORTATION

June 29, 2000

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

## COALITION MEMBERS

Baker Rock

Community Newspapers

Lawrence R. Derr, Attorney at Law

Fisher Farms

Fred Meyer

Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce

Home Builders Association  
of  
Metropolitan Portland

Intel

Gary Katsion

Steve Larrance

Nike

Portland General Electric

Ted Spence

Tektronix

Westside Economic Alliance

Members of  
Rural Roads Operations  
Maintenance  
Advisory Committee

Members of  
Washington County  
Planning Commission

Members of  
Washington County  
Board of County Commissioners

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Some weeks ago a number of the region's business leaders requested that Tom Brian, Chairman of the Washington County Board of Commissioners, host a meeting to discuss the state of the region's transportation strategies. These leaders were concerned that the resounding defeat of Measure 82 (the legislature's gas tax proposal) further widened the immense chasm between the region's land use and transportation planning goals and a base ability to fund improvements required to implement those goals. In response to the request, members of the County Commission created an ad hoc committee of diverse business interests to advance discussion of the acute transportation situation.

The group, called the *Westside Business Coalition on Transportation*, has held three morning meetings to date. Already, a clear consensus has developed around some fundamentals.

The committee generally supports the broad aspirations in the 2040 Framework Plan, but is extremely concerned about the details and implications of implementation. As the urban growth boundary is a necessary element of Oregon's growth management strategy, they accept the need for greater density within existing communities, as well as in expansion areas. At the same time they see unacceptable levels of traffic congestion increasing, unimpeded, under the current planning approach. They do not see a strong link between planning for development and the provision of transportation infrastructure to serve it.

An efficient and a complete system of roads is critically necessary to our business needs, the functioning of a public transit system, and the general mobility needs of the public. The proposal to reduce the mobility standard to achieve an "adequate" system, in some cases to service level F in the peak hour, is not an acceptable methodology. If gridlock is to be the standard, they fear for our ongoing ability to conduct business in the Portland metropolitan region. Not only will they not be able to move people and goods, but the degraded quality of life will impact their ability to recruit and retain the employees they need.

The coalition is committed to alternative modes of travel, and particularly public transit as a key element of meeting the transportation needs of the region. Indeed, many of the coalition members are in the forefront in innovating trip reduction strategies that reduce traffic

congestion. However, they believe our existing public transit system is not meeting their current needs, and they do not see improvements in the future adequate to reverse the degradation in mobility.

Even with a reduced level of service, the needed transportation improvements will require an additional \$8 billion capital infusion. Given that we were unable to attain a minimum level of additional funding through the gas tax proposal, their collective concern about future traffic congestion has escalated to a very high level.

After considering the above, the Westside Business Coalition on Transportation requests that Metro postpone the adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan for a minimum of six months. During this period, they propose that Metro, in cooperation with its member jurisdictions, conduct the following efforts:

1. Develop a more thorough impact analysis of the Regional Transportation Plan on the region's economy that assesses the impact of congestion on commerce activities;
2. Evaluate the 2040 Growth Concept in light of the apparent inability to afford infrastructure that makes 2040 work;
3. Engage local jurisdictions, communities and businesses in additional discussion on the consequences of the RTP; including decisions regarding the plan's design, funding and implementation;
4. Postpone any consideration of requesting a regional gas tax/vehicle registration increase of region's voters during the six-month period.

The members of this coalition are committed to maintaining a high quality of life in the Portland area. They are, however, concerned that the region's planning efforts are progressing at a rate where the implications of those plans, and the ability to fund the required improvements, are not adequately linked.

The coalition is ready to work with Metro, local governments and others, in developing a transportation plan that is far reaching and workable. We look forward to discussing these issues with the leadership of Metro. We will be inviting you to meet with us in the near future.

Submitted at the request of the Westside Business Coalition on Transportation.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Brian, Chairman  
Board of County Commissioners

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roy Rogers, Commissioner  
Washington County JPACT Rep

July 12, 2000

Honorable Lou Ogden  
Mayor, City of Tualatin  
Chair, Metro Policy Advisory Committee  
21040 SW 90<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Tualatin, OR 97062-9346

RE: Urban Growth Management Functional Plan: Title 2

Dear Honorable Ogden,

I am concerned about a proposed amendment to the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, Title 2 that will be discussed at the July 12<sup>th</sup> MPAC meeting.

Attachment C of the July 12<sup>th</sup> MPAC meeting packet proposes to repeal the Title 2 reporting requirements for local compliance with the functional plan parking ratio requirements. The functional plan was adopted into the Department of Environmental Quality's 1996 Ozone Maintenance Plan for the Portland area. The Ozone Maintenance Plan is a federally enforceable State Implementation Plan under Title 1 of the federal Clean Air Act. The Ozone Maintenance Plan specifically includes Title 2 of the functional plan as a transportation control measure. Changes to a transportation control measure in the maintenance plan require a lengthy substitution process that includes the following steps: 1) interagency consultation, 2) public comment, 3) Environmental Quality Commission adoption, and 4) Environmental Protection Agency approval. Since Title 2 is included as a transportation control measure in the maintenance plan, it is DEQ's responsibility to ensure that the stringency of the measure is not reduced. This means that if any part of Title 2 is modified to reduce the stringency, whether it is the actual parking ratios or the performance standard (reporting requirements), the substitution process will be triggered.

It is my understanding that Metro has opted to comply with the state Transportation Planning Rule requirement to reduce reliance on the automobile through the alternative language added in September 1998 (OAR 660-012-0045(5)(d)(A-F)). In order for Metro to fully comply, additional language needs to be added to Title 2 of the functional plan. Specifically, Metro must amend Title 2 to add language comparable to TPR OAR 660-012-0045(5)(d)(E-F) with the understanding that OAR 660-012-0045(5)(d)(A-D) has already been addressed in Title 2.

I recommend that Metro not repeal the reporting requirements included in (D)(1) and (D)(2) of Title 2. The substitution process would not likely go into effect if only (D)(1) is repealed (reporting number and location of newly developed parking spaces), but I recommend retaining this requirement. The information generated may be beneficial to monitor or update the transportation planning rule or functional plan in future years. However, (D)(2) provides essential compliance reporting to support the parking ratio requirement and a repeal of this language would clearly trigger the substitution requirement explained above. I support the additional language suggested in Attachment C, noted as the new (D) & (E) under Title 2 and (ggg) under Title 10. This language enhances Title 2 and



Lou Ogden, Mayor, City of Tualatin

07/12/00

Page 2

does not detract from the original Title 2 language.

Thank you for considering my comments on the proposed amendment to Title 2 of the functional plan. Please call me at 229-5397 if I can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Andrew Ginsburg for AG". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Andrew Ginsburg

Air Quality Division Administrator

cc: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director  
Metro

Rod Park, Metro Councilor  
Chair, Growth Management Subcommittee  
Metro

Bob Cortright, Department of Land Conservation & Development

LTR/AQ78018.doc






METRO

DATE: June 29, 2000

TO: JPACT Members and Interested Parties

FROM:  Andrew C. Cotugno, Growth Management and Transportation Director

SUBJECT: TPAC Recommendations on RTP Public Comments

\* \* \* \* \*

Attached, please find a summary of final public comments in Attachment 1 and accompanying TPAC recommendations for amendments to the draft RTP. The final public comment period began on May 15, 2000, and this packet summarizes and responds to comments received through the close of the comment period June 29, 2000, including those comments received at the June 29 public hearing.

The TPAC recommendations are grouped according to proposed "discussion" and "consent" items. TPAC recommends that JPACT approve the "consent" items in Part 2 of Attachment 1 as a group, and take individual action on the three "discussion" items contained in Part 1 of Attachment 1. The original comments that are the basis for the TPAC recommendations will be provided to JPACT at the July 13 meeting, as part of the final RTP Public Comment Report.

**Attachment 1** - This attachment includes TPAC recommendations on substantive public comments on the draft RTP and supplemental revisions documents submitted through June 29, 2000. Part 1 is recommended for discussion by JPACT and Part 2 is recommended for adoption by consent.

**Attachment 2** - This attachment includes proposed revisions to the RTP Preface and Introduction sections that provide a more complete overview of how the RTP addresses state and federal regulations. These revisions were recommended by TPAC at their June 30 meeting.

**Attachment 3** - This attachment includes proposed revisions to Chapter 5 of the draft RTP, replacing the "Existing Resource" system in Section 5.0 through 5.1 with the Financially Constrained system descriptions, findings and conclusions. These revisions were prepared in response to a comment from the FHWA, and are necessary to maintain certification of the RTP as a federally recognized plan. It also includes proposed revisions to the financial analysis contained in Section 5.4 of the draft RTP. The financial revisions were prepared at the direction of JPACT.

**Attachment 4** - As part of the RTP update, TPAC is recommending these revisions to the regional parking provisions of Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and a supporting revision to Title 10, the definitions section of the UGMFP.

**Attachment 5** - The final RTP Public Comment Report is still in production, and will be provided to JPACT at the July 13 meeting. The report will include all comments received during the May 15 through June 29 comment period, and other supporting documentation, including minutes from the June 29 Council public hearing.



**METRO**

**Attachment 1**

**June 30, 2000**

**TPAC Recommendations on  
Public Comments**

# Part 1

## Proposed Discussion Items

**Comment 1:** The urban growth boundary along the southern edge of Sherwood should not be expanded until the I-5 to 99W connector is studied, and a general alignment or no-build decision has been made. (Tom Aufenthie, 6/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 1:** Agree, however, this issue is most appropriately addressed as part of the ongoing urban growth boundary discussion. The RTP has recommended a corridor refinement study for the Tualatin-Sherwood connector that considers a "southern" alignment along the south edge of Sherwood. The RTP also requires that the refinement plan consider opportunities for a southern alignment of the connector to serve as a "hard edge" to the urban area, forming a long-term boundary between urban and rural uses. As such, TPAC recommends that this potential for a combined land use and transportation analysis be considered as part of upcoming urban growth boundary expansion deliberations, and that expansion in this area be linked to the completion of the Tualatin-Sherwood connector study. To better frame this issue within the RTP, TPAC recommends the following revisions to the I-5/99W Connector corridor study description on page 6-28 of the draft RTP:

"....This connection will have significant effects on urban form in the this rapidly growing area, and the following design considerations should be addressed in a corridor plan:

- link UGB expansion in this area to the corridor plan, and examine the potential for the proposed highway to serve a "hard edge" in the ultimate urban form of the Sherwood area."

**Comment 2:** Allow greater public outreach on the LOS policy, 2040 land use implications and RTP finance, and delay adoption of the RTP by six months to accomplish this. (Westside Economic Alliance, 6/28/00; Washington County, 6/29/00; Westside Business Coalition on Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 2:** The comments from the Washington County business groups represent an opportunity to further engage the public in a discussion of the region's transportation policies and projects. Therefore, TPAC recommends a post-adoption activity be initiated to address the following concerns, as set forth in the comments from the Westside Business Coalition:

- Develop a more thorough impact analysis of the RTP on the region's economy that assess the impact of congestion on commerce activities.
- Evaluate the 2040 Growth Concept in light of the apparent inability to afford infrastructure that makes 2040 work.
- Engage local jurisdictions, communities and businesses in additional discussion on the consequences of he RTP, including decisions regarding the plan's design, funding and implementation.

- Postpone any consideration of requesting a regional gas tax/vehicle registration increase of the region's voters during the six-month period.

TPAC recommends that these tasks be addressed in the spirit of implementing the RTP, and that any recommendations or subsequent refinements to the RTP be promptly incorporated into the plan. TPAC recommends that a specific timeline for completing this additional analysis and outreach be developed in conjunction with the business community as part of the expanded outreach effort.

However, the 2000 RTP is the culmination of a five-year update that has been based on an expansive public outreach effort, and should be adopted to provide a clear statement of proposed transportation policy direction.

**Comment 3:** The financially constrained system should be elevated to a more prominent role in the body of the RTP, since it serves as the federally-recognized system for the purpose of federal transportation planning, air-quality and funding requirements (FHWA, 5/23/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 3:** Amendment recommended. To better clarify the relationship between, and corresponding roles the financially constrained and strategic systems, TPAC recommends revising the Preface and Introduction sections of the draft RTP, as shown in Attachment 2. TPAC also recommends replacing the "Existing Resource System" section in Chapter 5 of the draft RTP with the "Financially Constrained System" text shown in Attachment 3. In addition, TPAC recommends updating the projects maps in Chapter 5 to portray both the financially constrained and strategic systems.

Because of the importance in communicating these systems to the public, TPAC recommends that communication tools be developed following adoption of the plan. Metro has proposed a "magazine" synopsis of the plan, and TPAC recommends that this synopsis be developed as a

# Part 2

## Proposed Consent Items

### Chapter 1

**Comment 4:** The RTP level of service policy is not adequate and could negatively impact business in the region and quality of life; an analysis mid-day congestion is also needed. (Westside Economic Alliance, 6/28/00; Washington County, 6/29/00; Westside Business Coalition on Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 4:** No change recommended. The LOS policy was the focus of a lengthy analysis and debate in 1996-97, and reflects a considered balance between the need for mobility on the roadway system, and the financial limitations and community impacts of "fixing" all congestion. The LOS policy is based on the conclusion that without a broad-based congestion pricing policy, it would be either impossible or impractical to relieve peak-hour congestion to a high standard on many of the region's major travel corridors. However, the policy does not preclude jurisdictions from establishing a local, higher standard than the regional policy, with some conditions. Therefore, it is appropriate that the business interests in Washington County consider this option as part of developing the Washington County TSP.

A mid-day congestion analysis was completed as part of a series of post-resolution refinements to the plan in early 2000. The mid-day system performance is generally very good, and LOS policy is only an issue in a small number of localized areas. These findings supported the overall LOS policy, though they are not included in the RTP document. Analysis materials from the mid-day modeling were provided to major jurisdictions in the region, including the counties and larger cities.

**Comment 5:** Designate Tualatin town center as an Area of Special Concern because segments of Boones Ferry Road and Martinazzi Road do not meet RTP level-of-service standards despite significant improvements in the area that include expanded transit service, I-5 to 99W Connector, Washington County commuter rail and various connectivity improvements. (City of Tualatin, 6/8/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 5:** Amend as requested with the recognition that the Tualatin transportation system plan will further evaluate motor vehicle congestion within the town center consistent with Section 6.7.7 in Chapter 6 of the Regional Transportation Plan.

**Comment 6:** Amend RTP Policy 7.0 to include the following language as an additional objective for consistency with Chapter 3 of the Regional Framework Plan, "New transportation and utility projects shall seek to avoid fragmentation and degradation of components of the Regional System. If avoidance is infeasible, impacts shall be minimized and mitigated." (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 6:** Amend as requested with the following text:: New transportation and related utility projects shall seek to avoid fragmentation and degradation of components of the Regional System. If avoidance is infeasible, impacts shall be minimized and mitigated.

**Comment 7:** Amend Section 1.3.6 (Mode Split Targets) to reflect the mode split as adopted in the Clackamas County Comprehensive Plan for the Clackamas Regional Center Plan.

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 7:** Clackamas County did an admirable job in establishing mode share targets for the Clackamas Regional Center Plan, which was studied and adopted prior to completion of the RTP. However, the County must revisit the Clackamas Regional Center Plan mode share targets within one year of adoption of the RTP, as is required in Chapter 6, Section 6.4.6. Table 1.3 in Chapter 1, Section 1.36 notes that the targets reflect conditions appropriate for the year 2040 and are needed to comply with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule objectives to reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles.

**Comment 8:** Change Policy 20.1 to prioritize funding of projects or planning that achieve complete communities over projects that expand inter-regional transportation capacity (Sierra Club Columbia Group).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 8:** No change recommended. This policy prioritizes which land use components of the 2040 land use designation will receive priority for transportation resources; it does not prioritize the type of projects within those land uses that should receive priority. The transportation projects most needed to implement the 2040 vision for these land use types will be defined by the local planning efforts in each of the individual areas. Due to differences in such areas as maturity of urban form and infrastructure, land use capacity, geographic location, and local economy, different types of transportation solutions will be appropriate in different centers to achieve a 2040 land use vision. Therefore, it is not appropriate to prescribe a particular type of transportation solution to every 2040 land use designation.

**Comment 9:** Fish passage has been identified as a major obstacle to sustaining healthy fish populations in the Metro area. As currently written, however, culvert removal and replacement would fall to a second tier priority based on policy 20.2. The RTP should more explicitly reflect the priority of natural resource protection from Chapter 1 in funding priorities. Amend the objectives under Policy 20.2 as follows to make funding for transportation facilities that also meet environmental objectives a first tier priority:

**Policy 20.2 Transportation System Maintenance and Preservation**

a. Objective: Place the highest priority on projects and programs that preserve or maintain the region's transportation infrastructure, retrofit or remove culverts identified in the region's fish passage program.

b. Objective: Place a high priority on projects and programs that preserve or maintain the region's transportation infrastructure.

b.c. Objective: Place less priority on projects and programs that modernize or expand the region's transportation infrastructure.

(Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 9:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 10:** Revise Figure 1.17 (Regional Freight System Map) to include the rail system in the Rivergate area. (Port of Portland, 5/26/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 10:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 11:** The Happy Valley TSP, adopted December, 1998, included a proposed "collector study area" between the intersection of SE Clatsop and SE 132<sup>nd</sup> to SE Mt. Scott Boulevard. This segment was shown as a collector study area in the Happy Valley TSP because portions of the study area are within the Portland city limits. (Happy Valley, 6/8/2000)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 11:** Amend regional transportation system maps in Chapter 1 as follows:

- **Regional Street Design System:** Add a dashed line between the intersection of SE Clatsop and SE 132<sup>nd</sup> to SE Mt. Scott Boulevard to designate a proposed Community Street.
- **Regional Motor Vehicle System:** Add a dashed line between the intersection of SE Clatsop and SE 132<sup>nd</sup> to SE Mt. Scott Boulevard to designate a proposed Collector of Regional Significance.
- **Regional Bicycle System:** Add a dashed line between the intersection of SE Clatsop and SE 132<sup>nd</sup> to SE Mt. Scott Boulevard to designate a proposed Community Connector Bikeway.

In addition, add King Road from 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the Regional Bicycle System Map as a proposed Community Connector Bikeway for consistency with the Happy Valley TSP adopted in December, 1998.

**Comment 12:** Give transit vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians right-of-way and signal priority over automobiles in all circumstances. (Penny Roth, 6/1/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 12:** No change is recommended. Where there is significant transit traffic, all transportation facilities designated as regional transit facilities are designated to receive significant capital improvements to increase transit vehicle speed and passenger comfort. This includes signal priority and que-jump lanes for transit vehicles where such devices will increase speed and/or reliability of transit service.

## **Regional Street Design Policies**

**Comment 13:** Amend the RTP to include language to address how to resolve conflicts between RTP Figure 1.4 and local planning activities that locate boulevard designations in local land use and transportation plans for regional and town center areas. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 13:** No change is recommended. Section 6.4.8 in Chapter 6 of the RTP allows for findings of consistency with the RTP as part of Metro review of local plan amendments. Based on a finding of consistency with RTP policies, the revision will be specifically proposed for inclusion in future updates to the RTP. Proposed amendments to the RTP are not effective until a formal amendment has been adopted, however, the purpose of endorsing such proposed changes is to allow local governments to retain the proposed transportation solution (or in this case regional street design classification) in local plans as long as a finding of consistency with the RTP has been made.

**Comment 14:** Change classification of McLoughlin Boulevard between SE Stephens and Highway 224 from Highway to Regional Boulevard. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 14:** No change is recommended. McLoughlin Boulevard will continue to serve as the primary motor vehicle connection from the central city to Milwaukie town center and Clackamas regional center and the southeastern portion of the region. Recognizing this important function, McLoughlin Boulevard is designated as a principal arterial on the motor vehicle system map, making it appropriate for McLoughlin Boulevard to remain designated as a Highway.

Highways are motor vehicle oriented with generally limited access that may include occasional driveways and a mix of at-grade and separated grade street intersections. In addition, Highway designs include striped bicycle lanes and pedestrian sidewalks with optional landscape buffering with improved pedestrian crossings located at overpasses or at-grade intersections. Thus, the Highway design can serve the regional mobility function of this roadway while also accommodating bicycle, pedestrian and transit access needs along the corridor.

**Comment 15:** Change classification of Tualatin Valley Highway in Beaverton, Aloha and Hillsboro from Highway to Regional Boulevard. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 15:** No change is recommended. The draft RTP proposes a Regional Street designation for Tualatin Valley from Highway 217 to Cedar Hills Boulevard (within Beaverton regional center) and from Brookwood Avenue to Baseline/10th Avenue (entering Hillsboro). A Regional Boulevard designation is proposed for Tualatin Valley Highway from 10th Avenue to 1st Avenue. An Urban Road designation is proposed for the section of Tualatin Valley Highway from Cedar Hills Boulevard to Brookwood Avenue (including the section within Aloha) where buildings are less oriented to the street.

The appropriateness of these street design designations and corresponding motor vehicle functional classifications will be evaluated as part of corridor study for Tualatin Valley Highway.

**Comment 16:** Change classification of St. Helens Road in Linnton from Highway to Regional Boulevard. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 16:** No change is recommended. US 30 (St. Helens Road) in Linnton will serve as the primary motor vehicle and freight connection from the central city and Columbia Corridor to destinations west of the region. Recognizing this important function, US 30 is designated as a principal arterial on the motor vehicle system map. As such, it is appropriate for US 30 to remain designated as a Highway. A Regional Boulevard designation generally applies to Major Arterial streets within major centers of activity such as regional and town centers.

**Comment 17:** Amend RTP language to require local jurisdictions to adhere to the design guidelines adopted in *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040* (1997). (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)



**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 17:** No change is recommended. One of the key findings of the regional street design work team was that many local jurisdictions have already adopted, or are developing, street design ordinances that will help implement the 2040 Growth Concept. In recognition of these efforts, staff supports implementing the regional street design concepts as guidelines rather than standards and using financial incentives through the MTIP criteria to leverage consideration of regional street design guidelines. Any project that competes for regional funding is required to be consistent with the design guidelines adopted in *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040* (1997).

**Comment 18:** Amend RTP to define a "Green Transportation Hierarchy" to that prioritizes street design elements in areas of limited right-of-way as follows: (1) walking, (2) bicycling, (3) transit, (4) goods movement, and (5) auto travel. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 18:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) addresses these tradeoff issues and is a resource for cities and counties to use when prioritizing street design elements within a constrained right-of-way.

**Comment 19:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to reduce lane widths from the 11 – 12 foot standard to 10 feet for most classifications of streets, particularly in the 2040 centers, to reduce auto speeds. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 19:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. Metro will update the street design handbook in the future and will consider this comment as part of the future update.

**Comment 20:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to increase the separation of the pedestrian from travel lanes by adding planting strips, street trees so that the minimum pedestrian area is 10 feet wide. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 20:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. However, the proposed language in Section 6.4.5(3)(a) on page 34 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* requires street design code language to allow for and support sidewalk widths of at least five feet and landscaped pedestrian buffer strips that include street trees. The street design guidelines in *Creating Livable Streets* recommend a planting strip minimum width of four to five feet for facilities designated as regional streets.

**Comment 21:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to limit the width of driveways to 24 feet and require a minimum 3 foot wide area of maximum 2 percent cross-slope. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 21:** No change is recommended. This is a local project design issue.

**Comment 22:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to require protection of the pedestrian space by adding such elements as street trees and bollards. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 22:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. The street design handbook recommends street trees and other streetscape features for arterial streets. Cities and counties are required to consider these street design elements as part project development of regional streets per Section 6.7.3 in Chapter 6 of the draft RTP. See also Section 6.7.3 on page 39 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* for additional amendments to this section.

**Comment 23:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to mandate legal pedestrian crossings every 400 feet along transit streets and in pedestrian districts and "treated" pedestrian crossings no less than every 1000 feet on other major streets. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 23:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. The street design handbook recommends consideration of mid-block crossings arterial streets when protected intersection crossings are spaced greater than 600 feet or so that crosswalks are located no greater than 300 feet apart in high pedestrian volume locations. Cities and counties are required to consider this street design element as part project development of regional streets per Section 6.7.3 in Chapter 6 of the draft RTP. See also Section 6.7.3 on page 39 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* for additional amendments to this section.

**Comment 24:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to require a reduction of curb return radii to reduce the turning speeds of autos and trucks. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 24:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. The street design handbook recommends reduced curb return radii for arterial streets. Cities and counties are required to consider this street design element as part project development of regional streets per Section 6.7.3 in Chapter 6 of the draft RTP. See also Section 6.7.3 on page 39 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* for additional amendments to this section.

**Comment 25:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to limit pedestrian crossing distance to 50 feet through the use of medians, a prohibition of multiple left turn lanes, etc. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 25:** No change is recommended. *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) provides guidelines, not standards, for use by local jurisdictions in the design of regional streets. The street design handbook recommends providing raised median pedestrian refuges at mid-block crossings on arterial streets where total crossing distance is greater than 60 feet. Cities and counties are required to consider this street design element as part project development of

regional streets per Section 6.7.3 in Chapter 6 of the draft RTP. See also Section 6.7.3 on page 39 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* for additional amendments to this section.

**Comment 26:** Amend the RTP or *Creating Livable Streets: Street Design for 2040* (1997) to require designs for the desired driver behavior rather than relying on signage to modify driver behavior encouraged by bad street design. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 26:** No change recommended. The proposed language in Section 6.4.5(2)(f) on page 36 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* requires cities and counties to develop street cross sections demonstrating dimensions of right-of-way improvements, with streets designed for posted or expected speed limits. In addition, amendments to Section 6.4.5(3)(d) on page 36 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* requires local street design code language to allow for and encourage consideration of traffic calming devices to discourage traffic infiltration and excessive speeds on local streets.

## **Regional Motor Vehicle System Policies**

**Comment 27:** Downgrade McLoughlin Boulevard between SE Stephens and Highway 224 from principal arterial to major arterial on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 27:** No change recommended. McLoughlin Boulevard will continue to serve as the primary motor vehicle connection from the central city to Milwaukie town center and Clackamas regional center and the southeastern portion of the region. Further access limitations on McLoughlin Boulevard are appropriate, which is a primary distinction between the Principal arterial and major arterial classifications.

**Comment 28:** Downgrade Tualatin Valley Highway in Beaverton, Aloha and Hillsboro from principal arterial to major arterial on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 28:** No change recommended. The draft RTP currently designates Tualatin Valley Highway as a major arterial.

**Comment 29:** Downgrade St. Helens Road in Linnton from principal arterial to major arterial on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 29:** No change recommended. US 30 (St. Helens Road) in Linnton will serve as the primary motor vehicle and freight connection from the central city and Columbia Corridor to destinations west of the region. Recognizing this important function, US 30 is designated as a principal arterial on the motor vehicle system map.

**Comment 30:** Downgrade Garden Home Road and Oleson Road north of Garden Home Road from minor arterials to local collectors on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 4/21/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 30:** No change recommended. This part of the region lacks an adequate east-west and north-south arterial street network, and Garden Home and Oleson roads have been included in past regional plans as minor arterials, consistent with local transportation system plans.

**Comment 31:** Designate Germantown Road as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 31:** No change is recommended. It is inappropriate for Germantown Road to be designated as a regional facility because of physical constraints throughout the corridor. Cornelius Pass Road is designated as an arterial and is intended to serve regional trips connecting northern Washington County to Highway 30.

**Comment 32:** Designate 143rd Avenue between Cornell Road and Bethany town center as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 32:** No change is recommended. This part of the region is supported by a good arterial street network. Designating 143rd Avenue as a Collector of Regional Significance would not serve a different travel function than Bethany Boulevard and Saltzman Road, which are designated as collectors of regional significance.

**Comment 33:** Remove designation of 143rd Avenue extension south of Cornell Road from the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map because this project is no longer included in the RTP. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 33:** Amend as requested. In addition, remove community street designation of 143rd Avenue south of Cornell Road from the Regional Street Design Map (Figure 1.4).

**Comment 34:** Designate Laidlaw Road between 170th Avenue and the Bethany town center as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 34:** No change is recommended. This designation could be considered for amendment to the RTP if identified as part of a complete collector level system and designated in the Washington County transportation system plan.

**Comment 35:** Designate 198th Avenue between Farmington Road and Baseline Road as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 35:** Amend as requested as a dotted line from Baseline Road to Rock Road and as a solid line from Rock Road to Farmington Road. In addition, designate 198th Avenue between Baseline Road and Farmington Road as a community street in Figure 1.4 (Regional Street Design Map).

**Comment 36:** Designate Barrows Road south of Scholls Ferry Road as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 36:** No change is recommended. Designating Barrows Road as a Collector of Regional Significance would not serve a different travel function than Scholls Ferry Road, which is designated as a major arterial in this part of the region.

**Comment 37:** Designate Kinnamon Road between 209th Avenue and Farmington Road as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 37:** Amend as requested. In addition, designate Kinnamon Road between 209th Avenue and Farmington Road as a community street in Figure 1.4 (Regional Street Design Map).

**Comment 38:** Designate Springville Road between 185th and Portland Community College as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 38:** No change is recommended. This designation could be considered for amendment to the RTP if identified as part of a complete collector level system and designated in the Washington County transportation system plan.

**Comment 39:** Designate Vermont Street east of Oleson Road as a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 39:** No change recommended. Designating Vermont Street as a Collector of Regional Significance would not serve a different travel function than Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway and Garden Home Road, which are designated as major and minor arterials respectively. In addition, this proposal is not consistent with the Portland transportation system plan.

**Comment 40:** Downgrade Oak Street west of 170th Avenue to a Collector of Regional Significance on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map to reflect move of Aloha town center designation to 185th at Tualatin Valley Highway. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 40:** Amendment recommended. Downgrade Oak Street from a minor arterial to a collector of regional significance from Murray Boulevard to Farmington Road.

## **Regional Public Transportation System Policies**

**Comment 41:** Delete regional bus designation on Walker Road east of Cedar Hills Boulevard on Figure 1.16 to reflect that regional bus service would not be provided on this segment due to location of Sunset and Beaverton transit centers. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 41:** Amend as requested. In addition, designate Park Way from Walker Road to Sunset transit center as regional bus. The regional bus service designation on Walker Road east of Cedar Hills Boulevard was made in error. The regional bus service designation should have continued north from Walker Road along Park Way to connect to Sunset transit center.

**Comment 42:** The following changes should be made to the Regional Public Transportation System Map (p 1-39) and/or the Transit Service Strategy map (p 5-13) to be consistent with City of Portland policies and/or existing and planned Tri-Met service. (City of Portland, 6/21/00)

1. **N Graham between Interstate and Williams:** Delete as a Regional Bus. Service on this street would be duplicative of proposed service on N Russell.
2. **N/NE Columbia:** Show Regional Bus designation between 21<sup>st</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> rather than 33<sup>rd</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup> to reflect existing service.
3. **SE 26<sup>th</sup>/SE 28<sup>th</sup>:** Change alignment to SE 26<sup>th</sup> between Division and Gladstone, SE Gladstone between SE 26<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>, and SE 28<sup>th</sup> between Gladstone and Woodstock to reflect existing and planned transit service.
4. **SE 20<sup>th</sup>/SE 21<sup>st</sup>:** Show SE 20<sup>th</sup> between Sandy and Division and SE 21<sup>st</sup> between Division and Powell as Regional Bus to reflect Tri-Met's planned service.
5. **NE 102<sup>nd</sup>:** Show 102<sup>nd</sup> between Glisan and Sandy as a Rapid Bus. Tri-Met will use this street segment between Gateway and Parkrose instead of I-205 to provide Rapid Bus service.
6. **SE Holgate:** Extend Regional Bus designation on Holgate to 122<sup>nd</sup> to reflect existing service.
7. **SE Harold:** Extend Regional Bus designation on Harold to 122<sup>nd</sup> to reflect existing service.
8. **SE 111<sup>th</sup>:** Delete as Regional Bus. The service on Holgate and Harold use 136<sup>th</sup> as turn arounds for the # 17 and 10 routes, not 111<sup>th</sup>.
9. **I-5:** Show transit designation on I-5, since bus service (and HOV lanes in north I-5) is currently running and is likely to continue. Portland classifies I-5 as a Regional Transitway.
10. **SW Salmon:** Change SW Salmon from transit mall to SW 1<sup>st</sup> to Frequent Bus to match designation west of transit mall. Also, connection from SW Salmon at SW 1<sup>st</sup> to the Hawthorne Bridge as Frequent Bus.
11. **SW Terwilliger:** Add Regional Bus designation to Terwilliger from Taylors Ferry to Barbur to reflect existing service. This segment is currently classified as a Major City Transit Street; the city is considering lowering the classification to a Transit Access Street but feel it should have service above Community Bus.
12. **Transit stop locations:** Delete transit stop at SW College and 9<sup>th</sup> (approximate). This stop is not needed because the Central City Streetcar alignment has changed.

13. **Central City Streetcar:** Revise Central City insert to reflect currently planned alignment using Mill between 6<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Market between 5<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> between Market and Montgomery and a NW-SE diagonal line between 6<sup>th</sup>/Mill intersection and 5<sup>th</sup>/Montgomery intersection.
14. **Macadam Corridor Frequent Bus:** Distinguish on the map that Macadam Avenue extends between Downtown and Lake Oswego as Frequent Bus. This line is clear on the Central City insert map but seems to disappear on the regional map.
15. **Macadam Corridor Commuter Rail:** The potential commuter rail line should indicate alternative alignments, one using the current Willamette Shore alignment, the other using the adopted rail corridor alignment in the Johns Landing Master Plan. Depending on the vehicle type, one alignment may be more appropriate over the other. This could also be clarified in the RTP text in the Specific Corridor Refinements section of Chapter 6 (discussing Macadam/Highway 43).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 42:** Amend Regional Public Transportation system Map (Figure 1.16) and Transit Service Strategy Map (Figure 5.4) as requested. In addition, add the following language to Chapter 6 as requested:

#### 6.7.5 Specific Corridor Refinements

##### Macadam/Highway 43

phasing of future streetcar commuter service or commuter rail in this corridor to provide a high-capacity travel option during congested commute periods, using either the Willamette Shore Line right-of-way, the John's Landing Master Plan rail corridor or other right-of-way as appropriate.

**Comment 43:** Add a major bus stop designation to Figure 1.19 on Molalla Avenue in the vicinity of Warner Milne Road or Beaver Creek Road and at the Amtrak rail station to connect the inter-city passenger service with the regional bus service. (Oregon City, 5/1/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 43:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 44:** Add a regional bus route on Main Street and Washington Street between the downtown transit Center and Highway 213 in Oregon City. (City of Oregon City, 5/1/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 44:** No change recommended. While a major transit stop is designated at the future Amtrak station and regional bus service is appropriate to link the station to the Oregon City regional center, it is not readily apparent how regional bus service could be routed to best serve this purpose. This comment will be forwarded to the South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Study with direction from RTP staff to consider how this service could be provided. Study recommendations will be considered for inclusion in the RTP.

**Comment 45:** The RTP should extend Rapid Bus designation from Tigard to Tualatin and Sherwood. Commuter rail in this corridor is unlikely to provide frequent all-day service available with Rapid Bus. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 45:** At this time, the RTP has designated Commuter Rail as the preferred high capacity transit improvement to Sherwood and Tualatin. Commuter rail studies are underway and are a high regional priority to receive funding. While currently being considered for peak-hour service, off-peak service can be added as demand warrants. Regional bus service is still designated for Sherwood and Tualatin with the ability for through service to Portland on the Barber Boulevard Rapid Bus route.

**Comment 46:** Highway 217 Corridor should include a study for the potential of a combined commuter rail and light rail corridor (with specific study recommendations). (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 46:** Commuter rail is the preferred high capacity improvement in this corridor at this time. Joint commuter and light rail service in the same corridor would duplicate service at greatly increased costs. Many of the same benefits of providing new light rail service could be achieved by increasing headways of commuter rail service or adding additional stations if warranted. No change recommended.

**Comment 47:** The railroad tracks along McLoughlin/Highway 224 Corridor should be improved to support inter-city passenger trains at the best possible speed. Review potential to provide speeds faster than 79 mph. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 47:** The RTP already designates this corridor for high-speed inter-city passenger rail service. ODOT has studied this corridor and has recommended a set of gradual improvements to the corridor to implement this service. The RTP recognizes and supports these recommendations which call only for improvements allowing up to 79 mph service within the region in the foreseeable future. No changes recommended.

**Comment 48:** The RTP should designate Rapid Bus on the Beaverton - Tigard corridor with a stop at Washington Square. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 48:** At this time, the RTP has designated Commuter Rail as the preferred high capacity transit improvement to Sherwood and Tualatin. Commuter rail studies are underway and are a high regional priority to receive funding. While currently being considered for peak-hour service, off-peak service can be added as demand warrants. Frequent bus is designated generally in this corridor along Hall Boulevard, providing all day local service in the corridor but with frequent headways between buses.

**Comment 49:** The RTP should study use of the railroad bridge between Milwaukie and Lake Oswego as a transit bridge with either rail shuttle service, a freight rail - bus transit facility. If bus improvements are feasible consider a Clackamas - Milwaukie - Lake Oswego - Tigard - Beaverton Rapid Bus designation using this route. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 49:** The RTP does call for a study (Project 5172) for future commuter rail service between Lake Oswego and Portland in which use of this bridge will be considered. During the process to define the scope of this future study, it would be appropriate to request consideration of bus improvements to the bridge. Until that completion of such a study, frequent bus is the preferred designation between Lake Oswego, Tigard and Beaverton.



**Comment 50:** The Strategic system should include a Lents transit center improvement. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 50:** Agree, this is project 1011 in the plan. Amend Figure 1.16 - Regional Public Transportation System map to include a transit center designation.

**Comment 51:** Add a 102<sup>nd</sup>/112<sup>th</sup> Avenue regional bus between Lents and Gateway to the Strategic transportation system. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 51:** Section 3.4.2, describing improvements needed to the Lents town center, recommends provision of new north/south local bus service between Clackamas Town Center, Lents and Gateway generally along 92<sup>nd</sup> and 102<sup>nd</sup> Avenues. TPAC does not recommend a specific route for this service at this time without further study.

## **Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian System Policies**

**Comment 52:** Delete transit/mixed-use corridor designation on Walker Road east of Cedar Hills Boulevard on Figure 1.19 to reflect that regional bus service would not be provided on this segment due to location of Sunset and Beaverton transit centers. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 52:** Amend as requested. In addition, designate Park Way from Walker Road to Sunset transit center as transit/mixed-use corridor. The transit/mixed-use corridor designation on Walker Road east of Cedar Hills Boulevard was made in error, reflecting an error on the Regional Public Transportation System Map. The transit/mixed-use corridor designation should have continued north from Walker Road along Park Way to connect to Sunset transit center to support regional bus service along this corridor.

**Comment 53:** Amend Figure 1.18 (Regional Bicycle System) and Figure 1.19 (Regional Pedestrian System) in the final draft of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan to include the following changes:

- expand the North Willamette Greenway to include the Steel Bridge to St. John's section
  - add the Fanno Creek Greenway from the Willamette River to the Tualatin River
- (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, 6/28/00 and Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, Brian Newman, and Bob Acres, 6/29/00)

**Comment 54:** Add the I-84/Banfield trail from the Willamette River and Eastbank Esplanade Trail to the I-205 bike path. (Brian Newman, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, 6/29/00; Morgan Will, 6/29/00; Bob Akers, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, 6/29/00)

**Comment 55:** Add the following multi-use paths to the RTP as essential elements of the regional trail system:

- Fanno Creek Greenway Trail connecting the Willamette River Greenway from Willamette Park in Portland to the Tualatin River.
- North Willamette River Greenway Trail from the St. Johns Bridge to the Steel Bridge.
- I-84 Banfield Trail from the Willamette River and Eastbank Esplanade Trail to the I-205 bike lanes.

(Mike Houck, Audobon Society of Portland; Natural Resources Working Group of Coalition For A Livable Future, 6/13/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 53, 54 and 55:** Amend as requested. Add the I-84/Banfield trail to the RTP as requested, based on citizen testimony and Metro Council discussion at the June 29, 2000 public hearing. Add this concept with a dashed line to the Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) as proposed regional off-street corridor, and with a dashed line to the Regional Pedestrian System map as a proposed multi-use facility with pedestrian transportation function. Add as a feasibility study to the Preferred System in Appendix 1.1. Add Fanno Creek Greenway multi-use path and North Willamette River Greenway Trail to the Regional Bicycle and Regional Pedestrian System maps as requested. In sections where specific alignments are not identified, a dotted line will represent the proposed off street regional corridor on the Regional Bicycle System map, and a dotted line will represent the proposed multi-use facility with pedestrian transportation function on the Regional Pedestrian System map.

**Comment 56:** Add a future 40-Mile Loop trail segment to the RTP. The segment could be added as dashed line from 223rd Avenue at Marine Drive eastbound and north of Reynolds Metals, then southbound to new development in the Troutdale town center. (Bob Akers, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 56:** Amend as requested. Add this concept with a dashed line to the Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) as proposed regional off-street corridor, and as a dashed line to the Regional Pedestrian System map as a proposed multi-use facility with pedestrian transportation function. Add as a feasibility study to the Preferred System project list in Appendix 1.1.

**Comment 57:** Add the East Buttes Loop Trail to the RTP. (Bob Akers, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 57:** No change recommended. Defer addition of the East Buttes Loop multi-use path to the RTP, pending completion of the Pleasant Valley/Damascus Planning Study.

**Comment 58:** Add an extension of the North Willamette Greenway trail to the RTP. Extend the North Willamette Greenway north of the St. Johns Bridge to Pier Park, and connect to Smith and Bybee Lakes and to Kelly Point Park. (Bob Akers, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, 6/29/00).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 58:** Amendment recommended. Segments of this proposal currently exist on the RTP Regional Bicycle System Map (Figure 1.18) as regional access bikeway, community connector bikeway and proposed regional corridor (off street) bikeway. Segments of this proposal are also included in the 1992 Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan and the 1996 (updated 1998) City of Portland Bicycle Master Plan. The missing link is the connection from Pier Park to Smith and Bybee Lakes. Add this concept from Pier Park to Smith and Bybee Lake as follows:

- as a dashed line to the Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) as proposed regional off-street corridor;
- as a dashed line to the Regional Pedestrian System map as a proposed multi-use facility with pedestrian transportation function; and

- add as a feasibility study to the Preferred System project list in Appendix 1.1.

**Comment 59:** The Regional Pedestrian System for SW Portland as portrayed on Figure 1.19 of the Regional Transportation Plan is incomplete and not representative of the wishes of the residents of SW Portland. The transit streets are noisy, congested, feel dangerous, and are not pleasant places to walk. No one will walk there unless they live there or have no other choice. The system shows the transit corridors, which has little to do with the pedestrian needs of this community. The SW Trails Group, a committee of SW Neighborhoods Inc, and including representatives of the SW Hills Residential League are completing a 4-year effort designed to identify the major connections where people desire to walk. This effort has resulted in the identification of 7 Urban Trails. A copy of the routes is being sent under separate cover. I propose these 7 routes be added to the Regional Pedestrian System along with the Terwilliger pedestrian path. (Don Baack, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 59:** Decisions regarding the 7 urban trails should be made by the City of Portland within the context of the Southwest Urban Trails Plan and the City's TSP. The SW Trails Group should be commended for the significant undertaking of drafting the Southwest Urban Trails Plan, which includes the seven routes described above. Recently the plan was removed from the June 21, 2000 Portland City Council agenda to allow additional time for input from concerned citizens and other interested parties. It is important that issues of concern or disagreement regarding this plan be resolved prior to Portland City Council's adoption so that all partners can share in this vision.

**Comment 60:** The Regional Bicycle System proposals are more reasonable. The following changes in the regional system in SW Portland will improve the system by making it safer by moving bikes to little used local streets. Streets to be added:

- SW Ralston from Barbur to Terwilliger to provide a safer connection between Capitol Highway and Barbur, and to allow safer passage to Barbur and Terwilliger to proceed westbound on Barbur.
- SW Laview from Taylors Ferry to Corbett, Corbett to Custer, Custer to 4th /5th under the northbound ramp to I-5 from Terwilliger Blvd. A portion of this connection will be constructed in the near fall 2000.
- A new route from Hillsdale to Fairmont as an alternative to the route up Dosch Road, a very dangerous place to ride. From Hillsdale follow Cheltenham to Westwood Drive, Westwood Drive to Mitchell Street, Mitchell to Fairmont, Fairmont to Talbot, Talbot to Patton.
- Add an additional route from Patton and Hewitt along Hewitt to Scholls/Skyline. (Don Baack, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 60:** Oregon state law allows bicyclists to share the road with motorists, with the exception of some urban freeways. Bicyclists can legally ride on little used local streets such as Ralston and Laview, as well as busier streets such as Terwilliger, Capital Highway, Barbur Boulevard and Dosch Road. The proposed changes are local in nature and should be deferred to the City of Portland' TSP process. Rather than make changes to the Regional Bicycle System map, it would be more appropriate to include the local alternative streets described above in the 2001 edition of Metro's Bike There map.

**Comment 61:** I strongly support a heavy emphasis upon pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects throughout the plan. Whenever possible, I encourage projects to link together the regional multi-use trail network. Metro should analyze the multi-use trail system for gaps, and fill those gaps wherever possible. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 61:** Comment and support noted. Policy 16.0 (Regional Bicycle System) states the importance of providing a network of safe and convenient bikeways.

**Comment 62:** Add an I-84/I-205/Tillamook Multi-use Connector to the Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18). The 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to I-205 segment is an important link for the regional trail system. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 62:** Amendment recommended. Add I-84 as a proposed off-street regional corridor from the existing I-205 multi-use path to the existing I-84 multi-use path at NE 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Show the proposed corridor on Figure 1.18 as a dashed line. Add this segment to the Preferred System project list in Appendix 1.1 as a feasibility study.

**Comment 63:** All multi-use trail crossings of major or minor arterials should be grade separated. In reaching a final draft, Metro should identify every point at which a multi-use trail crosses an arterial and mark that intersection for a grade-separated crossing on the preferred plan. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 63:** Grade separation of multi-use trails at major and minor arterials is a specific project development and design issue, not a systemic RTP issue. No changes recommended.

**Comment 64:** Interstate 5 North design should include a multi-use path with grade separated arterial crossings from the Interstate Bridge to the Rose Quarter. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 64:** The Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) includes two north-south regional corridor bikeways, Denver/Interstate and Vancouver/Williams, that are parallel to I-5. No changes recommended.

**Comment 65:** The Willamette Shoreline corridor is well worth preserving and to do so the rail should be converted to a trail using the rails to trails federal legislation designed for this purpose. The conversion would still preserve the corridor for future rail use. (City of Lake Oswego, 5/9/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 65:** The Willamette Shoreline is shown on the Regional Bicycle System map in Chapter 1 of the RTP as a proposed regional off-street corridor. The dotted line representing the corridor is not intended to identify a specific alignment. Also, a rail/trail feasibility study is identified as a project in the RTP financially constrained system. The Willamette Shoreline is also shown on the Regional Public Transportation System map (Figure 1.16) with a potential commuter rail designation. The rail/trail feasibility study described above must be completed before a decision can be made on rail to trail conversion or rail and trail operation.

**Comment 66:** Regarding existing and future bikeways, envision safety, create better future bikeways and improve existing bike lanes. A half-foot wide bike lane near the edge of a narrow winding road like in the Northwest suburban area creates a hazardous situation for both motorist and bicyclist. (Raj Gala, 5/13/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 66:** RTP Policy 16.0 (Regional Bicycle System Connectivity) speaks to a safe and convenient regional bikeway system consistent with regional street

design guidelines. A half-foot wide bike lane is substandard. The preferred design width for bike lanes on regional streets is 6 feet for new construction and 5 feet on retrofit projects. Minimum bicycle lane width of regional streets in urban areas is 4 feet.

**Comment 67:** The McLoughlin/Highway 224 Corridor should include a separated multi-use path with direct connections to the Willamette Riverfront Trail, Springwater Trail and I-205 multi-use path. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 67:** No change recommended. The Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) includes on-street regional corridor bikeways in the McLoughlin/Highway 224 Corridor.

**Comment 68:** The Highway 217 corridor should include a parallel multi-use path to connect the planned multi-use path along Highway 26 to the planned Fanno Creek Greenway path (project 3071). (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 68:** The Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) includes on-street regional corridor bikeways on Canyon Road and Scholls Ferry Road to connect Highway 26 to the Fanno Creek Greenway. Figure 1.18 also includes a proposed off-street regional corridor bikeway, the Beaverton Creek Greenway that parallels Highway 217 from the Fanno Creek Greenway to Beaverton as well as a community connector bikeway on Cedar Hills Boulevard. No changes recommended.

## Chapter 2

**Comment 69:** Clarify second and third paragraph on page 19 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan*. Current text is confusing. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 69:** Amendment recommended. Revise the second paragraph under Section 2.3 on page 19 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "These subareas were used for governmental coordination purposes to illustrate facilities which serve related city, county and district areas as part of the functional plan role of this RTP. The location and boundaries of these subareas are for analysis purposes only, and roughly was based on the correspond to county boundaries. ~~2040 design types of central city, regional center and industrial areas. As an aid to 2040 Growth Concept implementation, these subareas are related to the functional plan role of this RTP, not the regional TSP.~~"

In addition, revise the first paragraph under Section 2.4 on page 19 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "The TPR requires that the regional TSP reduce reliance on the automobile as measured by vehicle miles traveled per capita. Providing opportunities for people to make fewer trips and shorter trips can reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita. As one part of the 2040 Growth Concept policy to balance jobs and housing, this subregional analysis serves as the basis for findings in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5, which establish the impact of expected growth in population, households and employment on regional transportation corridors that serve key 2040 design types. ~~combines regional center areas for a general analysis of the large regional center areas for a general analysis of the large major regional transportation corridors.~~ These corridors have the greatest traffic volumes and the longest trips among the highest concentrations of jobs and housing in the region. This

subregional analysis serves as the basis for understanding trip patterns based on the location of jobs and housing throughout the region and is a one tool for identifying ways opportunities to reduce the number and length of trips in these high volume corridors based on those trip patterns."

**Comment 70:** Clarify first paragraph in Section 2.5 on page 19 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to reflect that Priority System "adequately" meets regional transportation system needs, rather than meets all transportation needs identified by No-Build System. "(Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 70:** Amendment recommended. Revise first paragraph in Section 2.5 on page 19 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "If no new transportation projects or programs are constructed, the estimated population and employment growth will impact the existing regional transportation system. This No-Build System shows where additional regional transportation system needs are created by that growth. The regional TSP, then, adequately addresses those needs in the Priority System in Chapter 5. "

**Comment 71:** Do not drop the "Existing Resource System" from the RTP. (Steve Larrance, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 71:** No change recommended. The recommendation to replace the "Existing Resource" system with the "Financially Constrained" system in the main body of the RTP document is in response to a specific request by the Federal Highway Administration. While it would be possible to include both systems in the plan, staff's recommendation is based on the confusion that it would create, since the financial impact of the systems is very similar.

**Comment 72:** Amend the financially constrained system to reflect changes in ODOT priorities to use existing revenue for operations and maintenance only. (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 72:** No change recommended. The financially constrained system projects identified by ODOT did not assume that the gas tax measure would pass, and instead reflected the use of existing capital forecasted over the 20 year plan period.

## Chapter 3

**Comment 73:** Add a separate map (figure) to Chapter 3 of the RTP that shows the existing and planned Regional Trails System (adopted as part of the Greenspaces Master Plan and the Regional Framework Plan). This map should also include a specific category that identifies which trails are included in the 2000 RTP. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 73:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 74:** Figure 3.2 Existing and Planned Regional Bikeways under-represents funded bikeway improvements in Washington County. It is unclear why only funded facilities are defined as bicycle lanes and paths in the legend while all other elements of the legend are bikeways. For mapping consistency all elements of the legend should probably be defined as bikeways. Bikeway improvements funded under

MSTIP3 (in which bikeway design is not determined until project development) should be reflected as funded on the map. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 74:** Amend as requested. Metro staff will coordinate with Washington County staff to ensure that funded bikeway improvements in Washington County, including MSTIP3, are described in Figure 3.2.

**Comment 75:** Revise Western Economic Alliance label on Figure 3.4 (Existing and Proposed Transportation Management Associations) to read, "~~Western~~ Westside Economic Alliance." (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 75:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 76:** The TMA map in Chapter 3 shows Beaverton as a planned TMA, but a Beaverton TMA is not included in the RTP Project list. (Margaret Middleton, City of Beaverton, 06/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 76:** This is a clerical error. Revise the RTP project list to include Beaverton TMA in the preferred, strategic and financially constrained systems. Estimated cost should be shown with an asterisk and referenced to RTP project number 8056, which includes the estimated cost of future TMA start-ups based on current TMA funding projected to 2020.

## Chapter 4

**Comment 77:** RTP needs to analyze how to finance and provide adequate off-peak local transit service to provide an alternative to driving to the entire region. These costs should be compared to the costs of providing additional vehicle capacity on the road system. Specific recommendations on how Tri-Met could become more cost-efficient. (Bruce M. Pollack, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 77:** The RTP does analyze what it would cost to provide more off-peak community transit service. Of the new transit service proposed in the Strategic transportation system 23.2% of the new transit service hours are for increasing headways during the off-peak hours on existing transit routes (includes community and regional transit routes), 9.7% is for increasing the length of the service day on existing routes (includes community and regional transit routes), and 30.8% is for new transit service coverage (new routes, most of which is community service). The cost of operating this service is roughly an additional \$32 million per year to current expenditures by Tri-Met and SMART. These operating costs would increase over time to approximately an additional \$186 million per year needed by 2020. There would also be capital costs associated with purchasing additional vehicles and maintenance facilities needed to provide this new service. New buses for this additional service would cost approximately \$229 million in 1998 dollars.

There is no equivalent road projects for which to compare the costs of providing additional transit service. The concern that additional road capacity will be added without first considering other measures, such as additional transit service to address transportation needs, is addressed by Section 6.6.3 of the RTP which requires consideration of alternatives to address congestion prior to increasing road capacity. Both road and transit improvements are needed for the RTP to successfully implement state and regional planning goals.

Specific recommendations on how Tri-Met could become more cost-efficient will be forwarded to Tri-Met for their consideration.

## Chapter 5

**Comment 78:** Modify Section 5.4 and add new Section 6.8.14 to the RTP to reflect new transportation financing principles, funding concepts and an implementation strategy. (JPACT, 6/8/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 78:** Amendment recommended. See Attachment "B" for modified Section 5.4 and add the following new section 6.8.14:

### **6.8.14 Financial Implementation**

JPACT will convene a committee to address transportation funding issues. This committee will consider the information and concepts addressed in Section 5.4 and report back to JPACT with a funding implementation strategy and an analysis of how the strategy addresses the principles identified in Section 5.4.1.

JPACT and its transportation funding committee will work with other government agencies, private sector and non-profit agency efforts to address transportation funding in the state and region as it considers its implementation strategy. This effort will lead to proposals for new sources of transportation revenue to build, operate and maintain the RTP Priority system.

**Comment 79:** More attention should be given to funding the RTP, including the mechanisms and a preferred approach to close the funding gap over 20 years. (Westside Economic Alliance, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 79:** No change recommended. During the final phases of the RTP update, JPACT, MPAC and the Council have engaged in a number of detailed discussions on transportation finance, but a specific direction was not identified for the RTP. Instead, officials have directed the RTP to provide a range of funding scenarios that will inform an upcoming, post-adoption effort to identify new funding sources. This approach is also consistent with TPR requirements that transportation plans identify funding sources for needed improvements, but not necessarily a specific funding plan.

**Comment 80:** Absent a commitment for funding the plan, an annual progress report should be developed to identify the consequences of not obtaining funding for the strategic system. (Westside Economic Alliance, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 80:** Such a report is proposed in Metro's work plan, but has not been completed in the past due to budget restrictions. Metro intends to produce such a document as part of developing benchmarks, as specified in Section 6.5.3 of the draft plan. These benchmarks would be created as part of the next MTIP cycle.



**Comment 81:** Revise Section 5.4.1 to tie the region's choice of funding sources to accomplishing specific policy goals. Specifically, add the following language, "1) Increase the amount of land within the urban growth boundary available for development by reducing the area devoted to transportation needs, 2) Reduce the need for new road capacity by encouraging the most efficient use of the existing capacity, 3) Reduce traffic and congestion, 4) Encourage alternative modes of transportation including transit, biking and walking, 4) Reduce VMT, 5) Reduce air pollution and other environmental impacts from transportation uses, 6) Recover the full social costs of transportation choices from users and 7) Encourage the highest and best use of transportation facilities."

(Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 81:** No change recommended. These considerations are most appropriately addressed as part of the MTIP process where the most current regional priorities can be incorporated into funding decisions.

**Comment 82:** The discussion of Transit Discretionary funds (Section 4.1.1) should mention the \$475 million bond authorized by voters in 1994 for light rail to Clark and Clackamas Counties. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 82:** No change recommended. Section 4.1.1 describes federal funding that may be appropriated to this region, not a description of local funding sources. Section 4.1.3 describes property taxes as a source of local revenues and Section 4.4.3 (proposed to be moved to Section 5.4.2) describes property tax bonding as a potential source of new revenues for transportation. All four of the funding concepts for the Strategic system in Section 5.4.3 include property tax general obligation bonds as the means to match federal grants for transit capital projects. TPAC does not recommend mentioning the 1994 bonding authority specifically.

**Comment 83:** Include local excise taxes, such as a tax on parking spaces as a potential source of revenue. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 83:** Agree, language summarizing the potential for a fee on non-residential parking spaces has been recommended by Metro staff in the June 22, 2000 memorandum to TPAC to be included in Section 5.4.2.

**Comment 84:** Include a transit utility fee, in which public transit is treated as a utility, as a possible new funding source. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 84:** Amendment recommended. Section 5.4.2 describes the potential for assessment of a road maintenance fee as a means of paying for road maintenance. Funding concept 3 in Section 5.4.3, however, discusses the possibility of using such a fee to provide for transit operations. Amend Section 5.4.2, Special Fees and Levies to clarify that such fee could be used for transit operations as follows:

"Road Maintenance - Transit Utility Fee. A road maintenance or transit utility fee is a general assessment of properties for maintenance and/or operation of the transportation system that serves the property . . . Rates could be adjusted to collect revenues equal to all or some portion of the cost to maintain each jurisdiction's road system or to provide transit service to an area."

**Comment 85:** Section 4.4.1 should mention toll facilities as a potential source of revenue and allowed under ORS Chapter 383. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 85:** Section 4.4.1 (Proposed as Section 5.4.2) includes peak period pricing (tolling) as a potential new transportation revenue source. Studies are currently underway to evaluate the potential to apply peak period pricing in the region.

**Comment 86:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) narrative of project #3136 to read, "Widen the street to three lanes from Baseline Road to ~~Airport~~ Cornell Road and..." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 86:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 87:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) narrative of project #3134 to read, "Widen the street to ~~five~~ three lanes from Tualatin Valley Highway to Baseline Road." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 87:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 88:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) to change road names indicating 219th Avenue and 216th Avenue and replace them with Cornelius Pass Road from Cornell Road to Tualatin Valley Highway. (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 88:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 89:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) to add label for Project #3126 adjacent to #3134 label to reflect that both projects are included in the Strategic System during different time periods (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 89:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 90:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) to add Project #3126 during the 2006-2010 time period. (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 90:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 91:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) to revise time period for Project #3128 to be 2001-2020 to reflect Appendix 1.1. (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 91:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 92:** Revise Figure 5.16 (North Washington County Map) to resolve time period conflict for project #3223. The project is listed in Appendix 1.1 for the 2011-2020 time period and in Figure 5.16 in the 2006-2010 time period. (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 92:** Amend as requested.

## Chapter 6

**Comment 93:** Revise third bullet on page 28 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to remove reference to local travel needs. There are many non-regional (e.g. local) needs that are not addressed in the RTP. In addition, clarify the second sentence under this bullet to reflect that the Preferred System is established to meet all regional transportation needs, rather than the Priority System as is implied by the revised language. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 93:** Amendment recommended. Revise the second sentence in the third bullet on page 28 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "For the purpose of complying with this requirement, the Priority System in Chapter 5 of the RTP establishes ~~a transportation needs relevant to the Metro area. The scale of the improvements in the Priority System that~~ are adequate ~~for~~ to meet state, and regional and local travel needs in the Metro area, including..." The reference to the Preferred System is not appropriate in this section because the Priority System is the system used to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule requirements.

**Comment 94:** Revise first paragraph on page 35 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to convey that the Priority System addresses most congestion (not all) and that refinement plans and local transportation system plans may reveal additional transportation needs that are appropriately dealt with in the RTP. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 94:** No change recommended. Section 6.4.8 and 6.6.2 in Chapter 6 of the RTP clarify the process for amending the RTP based on more detailed evaluation of the local transportation system as part of refinement plans and local transportation system plan development.

**Comment 95:** Revise last sentence in first paragraph of Section 6.4.7 on page 34 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "Jurisdictions may adopt ~~other minimum alternative~~ standards that ~~do not exceed~~ allow less vehicle delay than the minimum LOS established in Table 1.2; ~~but the use of higher~~ However, the alternative standards must not: ..." (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 95:** Amendment recommended as follows: "Jurisdictions may adopt ~~other minimum alternative~~ standards that do not exceed minimum LOS established in Table 1.2; ~~but the use of higher~~ However, the alternative standards must not: ..."

**Comment 96:** Revise last sentence in first paragraph of Section 6.4.9 on page 36 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "Therefore, Metro will accept local plans under the following ~~three~~ four options." (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 96:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 97:** The proposed language in Section 6.4.10 on page 37 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* would establish standards that are difficult to interpret for a specific site and

allow no flexibility to contend with other requirements such as steep grades and wetlands. The amendments to subsection #1 are unnecessary, and should be deleted, because local jurisdictions are already complying with the TPR. (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 97:** No change recommended. The proposed language is included for the purpose of RTP consistency with OAR 660-12-0045(4). In addition, Comment 49 further amends Section 6.4.10 in response to direction from TPAC to provide additional language concerning major transit stops and pedestrian districts to reflect provisions in OAR 660-12-0045(4)(c).

**Comment 98:** Modify the RTP language regarding Major Transit Stops to allow:

- the option for a developer to provide a pedestrian plaza at a major transit stop rather than constructing a building within 20 feet of the stop; and
- the option for a jurisdiction to meet or exceed the requirements of at major transit stops through the implementation of a pedestrian or other planning district.

(TPAC, 5/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 98:** Amendment recommended. Add new language to Section 1.3.5 in Chapter 1 under regional transit network components to more clearly define major transit stops:

Major transit stops. Major transit stops are intended to provide a high degree of transit passenger comfort and access. Major transit stops are located at stops on light rail, commuter rail, rapid bus, frequent bus or streetcar lines in the central city, regional and town centers, main streets and corridors. Major transit stops may also be located where bus lines intersect or serve intermodal facilities, major hospitals, colleges and universities. Major transit stops shall provide schedule information, lighting, benches, shelters and trash cans. Other features may include real time information, special lighting or shelter design, public art and bicycle parking.

In addition, replace Section 6.4.10 on page 37 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read as follows:

#### **Chapter 6.4.10 Transit Service Planning**

Efficient and effective transit service is critical to meeting mode-split targets and the regional transit functional classifications are tied to 2040 Growth Concept land-use components. Local transportation system plans shall include measures to improve transit access, passenger environments and transit service speed and reliability for:

- rail station areas, rapid bus and frequent bus corridors where service is existing or planned; and
- regional bus corridors where service exists at the time of TSP development.

To ensure that these measures are uniformly implemented, cities and counties shall:

1. Adopt a transit system map, consistent with the transit functional classifications shown in Figure 1.16, as part of the local TSP. Consistent with the State transportation planning rule (Section 660-012-0045), amend development code regulations to require new retail, office and institutional buildings to:
  1. Locate within 20 feet of or provide a pedestrian plaza at major transit stops
  2. Provide reasonably direct pedestrian connections between existing transit stops and building entrances on the site
  3. A transit passenger landing pad accessible to disabled persons (if not already existing to transit agency standards)
  4. An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and underground utility connection from the new development to the transit amenity if requested by the public transit provider
  5. Lighting at a transit stop (if not already existing to transit agency standards).
2. ~~In lieu of (1) above, Consider adopting regulations beyond the minimum requirements of the State transportation planning rule (Section 660-012-0045) or this Regional Transportation Plan to implement their transportation plans designating pedestrian districts or other planning designations and adopting associated development code regulations as a means of meeting or exceeding the requirements of 1 above.~~
3. Provide for direct and logical pedestrian crossings at transit stops and marked crossings at major transit stops.
4. Consider street designs which anticipate planned transit stop spacing, location, and facilities (such as shelters, benches, signage, passenger waiting areas) and are consistent with the Creating Livable Streets design guidelines.

Public transit providers shall consider the needs and unique circumstances of special needs populations when planning for service. These populations include, but are not limited to, students, the elderly, the economically disadvantaged, the mobility impaired and others with special needs. Consideration shall be given to:

- a) adequate transit facilities to provide service
- b) hours of operation to provide transit service corresponding to hours of operation of institutions, employers and service providers to these communities
- c) adequate levels of transit service to these populations relative to the rest of the community and their special needs

**Comment 99:** Amend TPAC Recommendation on Comment 98 to add the following underscore language:

**1.3.5 Designing the Transportation System**  
**Regional public transportation system components**  
**Regional transit network**

Pedestrian district A pedestrian district is a comprehensive plan designation or implementing land use regulations designed to provide safe and convenient pedestrian circulation, with a mix of uses, density, and design that support high levels of pedestrian activity and transit use. The pedestrian district can be a

concentrated area of pedestrian activity or a corridor. Pedestrian districts can be designated within the 2040 Design types of Central City, Regional and Town Centers, Corridors and Main Streets, as designated in local plans. Pedestrian districts emphasize a safe and convenient pedestrian environment, and facilities to support and integrate efficient use of several modes within one area (e.g., pedestrian, auto, transit, and bike).

#### **6.4.10 Transit Service Planning**

Efficient and effective transit service is critical to meeting mode-split targets and the regional transit functional classifications are tied to 2040 Growth Concept land-use components. Local transportation system plans shall include measures to improve transit access, passenger environments and transit service speed and reliability for:

- rail station areas, rapid bus and frequent bus corridors where service is existing or planned; and
- regional bus corridors where service exists at the time of TSP development.

To ensure that these measures are uniformly implemented, cities and counties shall:

- 1) Adopt a transit system map, consistent with the transit functional classifications shown in Figure 1.16, as part of the local TSP. Consistent with the State transportation planning rule (Section 660-012-0045), amend development code regulations to require:

(a) At Major Transit Stops (OAR 660-012-0045 (4c))

1. Building location within 20 feet of or provision of a pedestrian plaza at the major transit stop
2. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections between the transit stop and building entrances on the site
3. A transit passenger landing pad accessible to disabled persons (if not already existing to transit agency standards)
4. An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter and underground utility connection from the new development to the transit amenity if requested by the public transit provider
5. Lighting at the transit stop (if not already existing to transit agency standards).

2. And, may designate pedestrian districts in a comprehensive plan or other implementing land use regulations as a means of meeting or exceeding the requirements of OAR 660-012-0045 (4a-c).

Pedestrian district designation shall address the following criteria:

- (i) A connected street and pedestrian network, preferably through a local street and pedestrian network plan covering the affected area.

Designated pedestrian districts should specifically consider, but are not limited to these elements: Transit/pedestrian/bicycle interconnection; parking and access management; sidewalk and accessway location and width; alleys; street tree location and spacing; street crossing and intersection design for pedestrians; street furniture and lighting at a pedestrian scale; and traffic speed.

When local transportation system plans are adopted, designated pedestrian districts should be coordinated with the financing program required by the Transportation Planning Rule.

3. Provide for direct and logical pedestrian crossings at transit stops and marked crossings at major transit stops.

4. Consider street designs which anticipate planned transit stop spacing, location, and facilities (such as shelters, benches, signage, passenger waiting areas) and are consistent with the Creating Livable Streets design guidelines.

(Richard Ross, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 99:** Amend as requested, except add definition of pedestrian district to Title 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

**Comment 100:** The strategic plan should include study of a Portland streetcar extension to John's Landing. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 100:** The strategic transportation system does include the construction of the streetcar to the North Macadam redevelopment area in the vicinity of John's Landing.

**Comment 101:** The strategic system should include a study of the potential and routes for the streetcar on the eastside (included some specific routes). (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 101:** Agree. Add a future study to the strategic list for the potential of and possible routes for the streetcar in inner eastside Portland neighborhoods.

**Comment 102:** The preferred plan should include bus service from Gateway transit center to Multnomah Falls. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 102:** The long range plan recognizes the potential for a new inter-city bus passenger facility in the Troutdale area for private tourist bus operations into the Columbia River Gorge (and other tourist) areas. This service is not a priority for public transit service. No change recommended.

**Comment 103:** Revise the first word in # 5 in Section 6.8.12 on page 42 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to be "assess." (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 103:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 104:** Revise glossary definition of posted speed on page 45 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to add a reference to ORS 811.105 and 811.123, because local codes do not set posted speeds in Oregon. (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 104:** Amend as requested with the following language, "Posted Speed – This term refers to the posted speed limit on a given street or the legal speed limit as defined in ORS 811.105 and 811.123 ~~local motor vehicle codes~~ when a street is not posted.

**Comment 105:** The RTP should allow as an exception to street connectivity requirements where streets or accessways would violate provisions of leases, easements, covenants, restrictions or other

agreements existing as of May 1, 1995 which preclude required street or accessway connection per the state Transportation Planning Rule. (City of Lake Oswego, 5/20/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 105:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 106:** Revise the connectivity requirements for street and accessway spacing in Chapter 6 to reflect the original intent of Title 6 connectivity requirements, which stipulated that accessway spacing requirements applied when a full street connection is not possible, and were not required in addition to full street connections that meet the connectivity requirement. (City of Portland, 6/14/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 106:** Amendment recommended. The original intent of the accessway provisions was inadvertently modified during subsequent revisions to Title 6. TPAC recommends the following revisions to Chapter 6 requirements on page 33 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to address this comment:

**Section 6.4.5 – Design Standards for Street Connectivity**

2. In addition to preparing the above conceptual street plan map, Cities and Counties shall require new residential or mixed-use development that will require construction of new street(s) to provide a street map that:
  - a. Responds to and expands on the conceptual street plan map as described in Section 6.4/5/1 for areas where a map has been completed
  - b. Provides full street connections with spacing of no more than 530 feet between connections, except where prevented by barriers such as topography, railroads, freeways, pre-existing development or water features where regulations implementing Title 3 of the Urban Growth management Functional Plan do not allow construction of or prescribe different standards for street facilities.
  - c. Provide bike and pedestrian ~~connections~~ accessways on public easements or rights-of-way in lieu of streets when full street connections are not possible. Spacing of accessways between full street connections shall be no more than 330 feet, except where prevented by barriers such as topography, railroads, freeways, pre-existing development, or water features where regulations implementing Title 3 of the Urban Growth management Functional Plan do not allow construction of or prescribe different standards for street facilities.

**Comment 107:** The narrow street provisions in Chapter 6 should be expanded to allow other local street design alternatives, such as woonerfs or urban lanes, that offer similar traffic calming benefits, and use a narrow right-of-way. (City of Portland, 6/14/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 107:** Amendment recommended. Revise Chapter 6 requirements on page 33 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to address this comment:



## Section 6.4.5 – Design Standards for Street Connectivity

3. Street design code language and guidelines must allow for and should encourage the following in support of the above development requirements:
  - a. Consideration of narrow street design alternatives. For local streets, no more than 46 feet of total right-of-way, including pavements widths of no more than 28 feet, cur-face to curb-face, sidewalk widths of at least 5 feet and landscaped pedestrian buffer strips that include street trees. Special traffic calming designs that use a narrow right-of-way, such as woonerfs and chicanes, may also be considered as narrow street designs.

**Comment 108:** The narrow street provisions in Chapter 6 should be clarified to acknowledge the appropriate use of additional right-of-way for swales or other on-site stormwater systems. (City of Portland, 6/14/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 108:** No change recommended. It is premature to incorporate provisions on “green” designs until the upcoming Green Streets project has been completed. This project will recommend specific design solutions for on-site stormwater treatment, and recommendations from the Green Streets study will include updates to the street connectivity provisions in the RTP. The Green Streets project is scheduled for completion in Fall 2001.

**Comment 109:** Section 6.8.1 (Green Streets Initiative) should reference the study of permeable surfaces for streets. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 109:** No change is recommended. The RTP outlines the major points of the study, one of which is the development of a best practices guidebook for design solutions where streets and streams meet. While permeable surfaces for streets is something that will be studied as part of the scope of work, it is not necessary to mention this level of detail in a project description in the RTP.

**Comment 110:** Revise the descriptions of the Highway 99E Area of Special Concern in Chapter 6 on page 40 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan*, as follows (City of Tigard, 6/14/00):

### 6.7.7 – Area of Special Concern

#### Highway 99W

The Highway 99W corridor between Highway 217 and Durham Road is designated as a mixed-used corridor in the 2040 Growth Concept, and connects the Tigard and King City town centers. This route also experiences heavy travel demand. The City of Tigard ~~has and Washington County have~~ already examined a wide range of improvements that would address the strong travel demand in this corridor. The RTP establishes the proposed I-5 to 99W connector as the principal route connecting the Metro region to the 99W corridor outside the region. This emphasis is intended to change in the long term changes the function of 99W, north of Sherwood, to a major arterial classification, with less need to accommodate longer, through trips.

However, for much of Washington County, Highway 99W will still be a major connection, linking Sherwood and Tigard to the rest of the County and linking the rest of the County to the Highway

99W corridor outside of the region. A number of alternatives for relieving congestion have been tested as part of the RTP update, and by the City of Tigard in earlier planning efforts. These efforts led to the common conclusion the latent travel demand in the Highway 99W corridor is too great to be reasonably offset solely by capacity projects. While the RTP proposed new capacity on 99W between I-5 and Greenburg Road, no specific capacity projects are proposed south of Greenburg Road, due to latent demand and the impacts that a major road expansion would have on existing development. As a result, this section of Highway 99W is not expected to meet the region's motor vehicle level of service policies during mid-day and peak demand periods in the future, and an alternative approach to managing and accommodating traffic in the corridor is needed.

Since statewide, regional and local travel will still need to be accommodated and managed for sometime ODOT, METRO, Washington County and Tigard should cooperatively address the means for transitioning to the future role of the facility to emphasize serving circulation within the local community. This will include factoring in the social, environmental and economic impacts that congestion along this facility will bring. Additionally the analysis should specifically document the schedule for providing the alternatives for accommodating the regional and statewide travel. Similarly the local TSPs should include the agreed upon action plans and bench marks to ensure the local traffic and access to Highway 99W is managed in a way that is consistent with broader community goals. Additional alternative mode choices should be ensured for Tigard and King City town centers. Tri-Met should be a major participant in the alternative mode analysis. The results of this cooperative approach should be reflected in the local TSPs and the RTP.

~~As such Therefore, the ultimate design and scale of improvements along long term system management of Highway 99W in the heavily congested Tigard section should be evaluated described as part of the Tigard, King City and Washington County TSPs, and factor in the social, financial and environmental impacts that congestion along adding capacity to this facility could bring. The primary function of Highway 99W should be the serve circulation within the local community, and implement the planned mixed used development in the Tigard town center and along 99W where the 2040 Growth Concept corridor designation applies. The local TSPs should also include specific action plans and benchmarks to ensure that traffic growth and access to Highway 99W is managed in a way that is consistent with broader community goals, and to ensure that alternative mode choices are provided in the Tigard and King City town centers. In addition, other possible solutions, such as ODOT's new program for local street improvements along highway corridors, may provide alternatives for managing traffic growth on 99W. Finally, the local TSPs should also consider changes to planned land use that would minimize the effects of growing congestion.~~

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 110:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 111:** Revise Section 6.7.7 related to Highway 99W section to specify that the Tualatin-Sherwood connector study should evaluate options for reducing traffic on Highway 99W from the intersection with the proposed connector to I-5. (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 111:** No change recommended. Section 6.7.5 already directs the Tualatin-Sherwood Connector study to evaluate access management and connectivity improvements along 99W in Tigard and their corresponding impacts on Tigard, Tualatin and Sherwood town centers. In addition, see TPAC recommendation on Comment 110.

**Comment 112:** Section 6.8.12 on page 42 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* mentions "Reverse Commute" which is not explained in the text. Clarify the pertinence of this section to the RTP. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 112:** Amend as requested. Add an opening sentence describing that Job Access and Reverse Commute is a FTA program funded through TEA-21. Define "job access" and "reverse commute" and further describe how the FTA program relates to the Portland Region Job Access Plan and the Regional Job Access Committee.

**Comment 113:** Clarify the incorporation of TEA-21 requirements for congestion mitigation in the RTP. (1,000 Friends of Oregon, 6/29/00).

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 113:** These requirements were formerly contained in Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, and are now located in Section 6.4.7 (Motor Vehicle Congestion Analysis) and 6.6.3 (Congestion Management Requirements) of the 2000 RTP.

**Comment 114:** Revise Section 6.6.2 to add a third option for amending the RTP that would allow for consistency with the Regional Framework Plan such that any updates to the Regional Framework Plan or related functional plans would also serve as a basis for updates to the Regional Transportation Plan. (Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, 6/28/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 114:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 115:** Revise Section 6.5.2 to add the following language, "Prior to each biennial MTIP process, JPACT shall adopt a recommended funding strategy with specific sources that will fully fund the strategic system during the remaining years in the RTP." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 115:** No change recommended. The purpose of the MTIP is to establish a short-term funding strategy for transportation improvements, not a 20-year strategy for funding the strategic system.

**Comment 116:** Revise Section 6.4.1 to add the following language, "All local TSPs must demonstrate that the local resources included in projections for the financially constrained system will be used for funding projects in that system." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 116:** No change recommended. It would be inappropriate for Metro to regulate local CIP actions. Metro's role is to guide overall improvements to the regional transportation through allocation of federal funds as part of the MTIP process.

**Comment 117:** Aggressively implement the benchmarks identified in Section 6.5.3. Revise Section 6.5.3 to read as follows, "In addition, benchmarks ~~should~~shall be designed to track the following information to the degree practicable for on-going monitoring." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation and 1000 Friends of Oregon, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 117:** No change recommended. Section 6.5.3 directs Metro to develop benchmarks as part of the next MTIP update. It is premature to require the benchmarks to address the referenced bullets until the benchmarks are established.

**Comment 118:** Revise Section 6.7.3 on page 39 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* following "...these provisions are simple guidelines for locally funded projects, except that all projects, including locally funded projects must show that they are consistent with Creating Livable Streets: Street Design Guidelines for 2040." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 118:** No change recommended. See TPAC recommendation on Comment 17.

**Comment 119:** For some time, we have been concerned about the existing jobs/housing imbalance in Clackamas County and the resulting impact on the County's transportation system. More work needs to be done to ensure that the land use and transportation plans are in balance and better coordinated. (North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce, 6/22/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 119:** Comment noted. Addressing the jobs/housing imbalance and better balance and coordination of the land use and transportation plans is a key component of the Regional Framework Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan.

**Comment 120:** Section 6.8.7, Jobs/Housing Imbalance. Clackamas County requests that Metro include in the RTP a commitment to staff and fund a work program to assist the County in the analysis of rural and EFU land along the Sunrise Corridor for potential use as urban land. If appropriate, designate new areas as Urban Reserves, (which needs to be approximately 2,600 acres for jobs). (Clackamas County Board of Commissioners, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 120:** Comment noted. A commitment to staff and fund a work program to assist the County is more appropriate for discussion during the adoption process for the annual Unified Work Program.

**Comment 121:** Add a new section under Section 6.8 (Outstanding Issues) to address affordable housing, "In many areas of the region, lack of access to affordable housing adds strains on the transportation system as people cannot afford housing close to their employment. Funding of affordable housing projects as part of the region's transportation strategy will be evaluated." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 121:** No change recommended. This issue is best addressed as part of the Regional Affordable Housing Plan currently underway. Metro transportation staff will coordinate with affordable housing staff as the regional affordable housing plan is refined, recognizing that recommendations from the regional affordable housing plan may need to be integrated into the RTP during the next RTP update.

**Comment 122:** Add a new section under Section 6.8 (Outstanding Issues) to address long distance commuters, "There is increasing number of commuters from outside the region. An evaluation of the

impact of this trend on the region's transportation system and Region 2040 plan will be done and options identified for addressing those issues." (Citizens for Sensible Transportation, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 122:** No change recommended. Section 6.8.3 identifies the need to incorporate ODOT's valley model into the regional model as part of the next RTP update to better evaluate how congestion, parallel routes and distribution of employment in and outside the region affects the region's transportation system. This is an important first step in addressing growth in travel demand between the Metro region and the Willamette Valley. However, other planning activities are already underway with ODOT and DLCD working as lead agencies. Metro will continue to work with these state agencies to ensure that regional interests are reflected in Willamette Valley planning decisions.

**Comment 123:** Amend Section 6.4.1, Chapter 2, to read as follows, "2020 population and employment forecast...as provided for in Section ~~6.4.8~~ 6.4.9 of this chapter..." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 123:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 124:** Amend Section 6.4.7(1), first paragraph, to read as follows, "...and that this level of congestion will negatively impact accessibility, as determined through Section 6.4.7(2)(b)." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 124:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 125:** Amend Section 6.4.7, first paragraph, to read as follows, "...any locations on the Regional Motor Vehicle System Map (Figure ~~1-8~~ 1.12) that are not addressed by the RTP." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 125:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 126:** Amend Section 6.4.9, first paragraph, to read as follows, "Therefore, Metro will accept local plans under the following ~~three~~ four options." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 126:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 127:** Amend Section 6.4.9, subparagraph 4, on page 36 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "However, population and employment data and forecasts and the methodology for generating the data and forecasts shall be coordinated..." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 127:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 128:** Amend Section 6.4.9, subparagraph 4, on page 37 in *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan* to read, "Subsequent differences in local TSP project recommendations that result from the differences in population and employment forecasts will be ~~resolved~~ incorporated in the next scheduled RTP update." (City of Hillsboro, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 128:** No change recommended. This proposal was discussed as part of preparing the *Supplemental Revisions to 1999 Regional Transportation Plan*. TPAC recommends that local forecasts that deviate from the regional forecasts be reviewed by Metro technical staff and TPAC as statistically valid prior to being incorporated into the regional forecast.

**Comment 129:** The narrow street provisions in Chapter 6 and calming devices on local streets could create public safety issues for fire departments in the region. (Larry Derr, 6/29/00 and Michael Kepcha, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 129:** No change recommended. The narrow street concept has been debated nationally by emergency response professionals, and has proved to be an acceptable practice. In reality, jurisdictions that provide fire protection for older neighborhoods already demonstrate this fact, since statistics have shown little difference in response times in older neighborhoods with narrow streets.

More importantly, the narrow street provisions represent a tradeoff for requiring a higher level of local street connectivity. In this way, the combined effect of these provisions should improve public safety response, since connected street system provide more alternative routes for emergency vehicles, and easier evacuations in emergency conditions.

**Comment 130:** The corridor study (Section 6.7.6) of Interstate 5 North should include a new fixed-span Interstate bridge with the option of converting existing bridges to local traffic, bikeways and/or transit. There are no specific designs for this project at this time, only a recognized need to provide additional capacity in this area. This comment will be forwarded to ODOT, and the Cities of Portland and Vancouver for consideration during the project design phase. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 130:** The RTP currently calls for the construction of additional Interstate Bridge capacity on the Interstate Bridges. To clarify that there is no specific design recommended for this improvement at this time, amend text to read as follows: • construct additional Interstate Bridge capacity ~~on the Interstate Bridges~~.

**Comment 131:** The corridor study (Section 6.7.6) of Interstate 5 South should include study of a tolled tunnel to eliminate the Terwilliger curves. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 131:** No change recommended. The capital expenditure necessary for such a project is not a priority for the potential benefits of a tunnel facility in this area.

**Comment 132:** The I-205 Transportation solutions should include grade-separated improvements to the multi-use path. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 132:** There are no specific designs for this project at this time, only a recognized need to provide improvements to the path at intersections. This comment will be forwarded to ODOT and the City of Portland for consideration during the project design phase.

**Comment 133:** The McLoughlin - Highway 224 corridor should include the gradual improvement of converting the highway to a freeway (with specific design recommendations). (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 133:** RTP recommendations for this corridor already include aggressive access management and grade-separation on Highway 224. Due to potential impacts and costs, a full freeway improvement is not recommended at this time.

## RTP Projects

**Comment 134:** Revise projects 6013 and 6030 to widen Hall Boulevard to five lanes from Scholls Ferry Road to Durham Road to widen the street to three lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes because the projects will:

- contribute to increased congestion
- reduce the taxable property base of the city of Tigard and harm the local economy
- displace small businesses
- create hardship for predominately lower and middle-class families.

In addition, the projects are not identified in the city of Tigard's February 2000 draft TSP. (Alexander Craghead, 5/4/00)

**Comment 135:** It is inappropriate to widen Hall Boulevard and Greenburg Road to five lanes due to the impact on neighborhoods and businesses. (Trudy Knowles, 6/10/00)

**Comment 136:** Revise projects 6013 and 6030 to widen Hall Boulevard to five lanes from Scholls Ferry Road to Durham Road to widen the street to three lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes because the projects will: contribute to increased congestion, harm the environment and displace small businesses and homes. In addition, the projects are not identified in the city of Tigard's February 2000 draft TSP. (Jill Tellez, 6/26/00 and CPO 4-M, 6/20/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comments 134, 135 and 136:** No change is recommended. The Washington Square regional center study concluded in September 1999 and recommended a series of projects to improve access by all modes of travel throughout the study area. The Study recognizes that Hall Boulevard is a state arterial roadway and a major travel corridor through the regional center, connecting to Beaverton regional center to the north and Tualatin town center to the south. Upgrading this facility is expected to reduce cut-through traffic in surrounding residential neighborhoods and will provide overall improvements in traffic flow throughout the area. The regional center study's recommendations include a project to widen Hall Boulevard to three lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes for the short-term, and endorses acquiring right-of-way for a five-lane roadway for future expansion to five lanes when traffic warrants such an expansion. The RTP identifies transportation projects and programs that address current and future needs that result from expected population and job growth throughout the region. RTP projects 6013 and 6030 reflect the longer-term need for a five-lane Hall Boulevard. The city of Tigard's draft TSP will be revised to incorporate all recommendations included in the Washington Square regional center plan, including the addition of Projects 6013 and 6030.

**Comment 137:** Provide drainage for our property as part of construction of RTP project 6030, widening of Hall Boulevard to five lanes from Locust Street to Durham Road. (Mr. And Mrs. Davis, 5/3/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 137:** No change is recommended. This project will undergo project design and construction by the city of Tigard, not Metro. This comment will be forwarded to the city of Tigard for consideration.

**Comment 138:** Remove Project #3025 (Tualatin Valley Highway widening) from the RTP and formally recognize that Tualatin Valley Highway has no prospects of significant expansion of capacity. (Walter Hellman, 6/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 138:** No change recommended. Section 6.7.6 in Chapter 6 of the draft plan recommends a study of Tualatin Valley Highway to address the local and regional transportation needs within the corridor from Beaverton to Hillsboro regional centers. Specifically, the section recommends evaluating a variety of strategies to address travel demand in the corridor, including capacity and transit improvements to Tualatin Valley Highway and other parallel routes such as Farmington Road, Alexander Road, Baseline Street and Walker Road. Other strategies to be examined include intersection improvements and access management throughout the corridor.

The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the need to do something to improve traffic flow in the corridor, as Tualatin Valley Highway serves as the principal connection between Beaverton and Hillsboro. The corridor study will determine exactly what kind of improvements will work best to balance the need to accommodate expected growth in travel in the corridor with the community's needs and concerns. The corridor study will include opportunities for public input and will be conducted jointly with staff from Metro, ODOT, Washington County, Beaverton and Hillsboro.

**Comment 139:** Schedule \$5 million for major investment study and environmental design work in the 2000-05 time period for project #6005 (Tualatin—Sherwood Connector). (City of Tualatin, 6/8/00, and Washington county 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 139:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 140:** Add Project # 6074 (65th/Tualatin River Crossing and connections) to the strategic system in the 2011-20 time period (City of Tualatin, 6/8/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 140:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 141:** Add description of location for Project # 3009 (Murray Boulevard to 185th Avenue) (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 141:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 142:** Add cost of \$8 million to description of Project # 3069 (Scholls Ferry Road Improvements) (Washington County, 6/12/00)



**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 142:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 143:** Add Project # 3175 (widen Barnes Road to five lanes from 119th Avenue to Highway 217) to the Strategic and Financially Constrained systems and remove projects #3177 (Cedar Hills/Barnes Road intersection improvements) and #3190 (143rd Avenue improvements) from the financially constrained system to balance to cost of the financially constrained system with the expected revenue. (Washington County, 6/12/00 and 6/22/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 143:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 144:** Revise description of Project # 3182 to be from 143rd Avenue to Dale Road with a project cost of \$6 million. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 144:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 145:** Add Project # 6000 (Peak-hour only commuter rail service from Wilsonville to Beaverton) to the Preferred system. (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 145:** No change recommended. Project #6001 represents the preferred level of commuter rail service – peak-hour and mid-day service.

**Comment 146:** Add a new project to widen 170th Avenue to five lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes from Blanton Street to Farmington Road. Add this project to the preferred system at a cost of \$8 million. (Murray Boulevard to 185th Avenue) (Washington County, 6/12/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 146:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 147:** Marine Drive is serving inappropriate levels of traffic and freight movement, given its physical constraints (D. J. Chalmers, 5/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 147:** No change recommended. Though it is both impractical and inappropriate to add vehicle capacity to Marine Drive, a number of parallel improvements are proposed on Northeast Portland Highway and Northeast Sandy Boulevard to provide more direct freight routes through the Columbia Corridor.

**Comment 148:** The I-84 to Hogan Road connector (project no. 1041/2042) is too costly, and would affect large tracts of public land that could otherwise be developed (D. J. Chalmers, 5/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 148:** No change recommended. The Hogan corridor is a principal arterial route in the RTP, forming a critical link between I-84 and Highway 26 in the Gresham area. The project will build on recently completed interchange improvements in Wood Village, and will slow through traffic growth on parallel north/south arterials in the area.

**Comment 149:** Commuter rail should be a higher priority in the RTP (D. J. Chalmers, 5/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 149:** No change recommended. Commuter rail will be considered in several corridor studies recommended in the RTP, most notably the I-5 South corridor, where commuter rail is one of the strategies that will be examined for serving Willamette Valley travel demand. The RTP also includes a commuter rail line between Wilsonville and Beaverton.

**Comment 150:** A new Willamette River bridge is needed south of the Sellwood Bridge in order to improve east-west access between the Sellwood and I-205 bridges (Daniel Peterson, 6/1/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 150:** No change recommended. The recently completed South Willamette Crossing Study examined this issue, and recommended a number of changes to existing street and bridges in this corridor, but not an additional river crossing. The recommendations of the South Willamette Crossing Study have been incorporated into the draft RTP.

**Comment 151:** Delete project no. 2076 (Marine Drive Extension in Troutdale) from the RTP, based on City Council study of transportation impacts (City of Troutdale, 5/24/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 151:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 152:** Improvements in the 99E/Highway 224 corridor should address both immediate capacity issues in the near term and accommodate the potential for light rail in the future. (Clackamas Co. Economic Development Commission, 5/19/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 152:** No change recommended. The RTP calls for more detailed corridor planning to identify specific highway and transit improvements in this corridor. The ongoing South Corridor study is in the process of evaluating transit options in this corridor, and is the most appropriate forum for this comment to be addressed.

**Comment 153:** The Clackamas County Economic Development Commission strongly supports transportation improvements in the South Corridor. A capacity improvement project that would facilitate the uncongested movement of buses and carpools in this corridor is preferred. While light rail remains the long-term solution in the McLoughlin/Highway 224 corridor, any new improvements built in this corridor should address immediate capacity issues in the near term and accommodate the potential for light rail in the future (Clackamas County Economic Development Commission, 5/19/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 153:** Comment and support is noted. The South Corridor Project will address these issues.

**Comment 154:** Proceed with South Corridor Transportation Alternative Study. (Clackamas County Commissioners, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 154:** No change recommended. See TPAC recommendation in Comment 152.

**Comment 155:** Supports light rail transit between Clackamas Regional Center and Portland but would like direct bus service in the interim before light rail is constructed. (Oakley Garnett, 6/2/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 155:** Will forward this comment to the South Corridor Study and the Tri-Met service planning department for their consideration of appropriate interim service improvements in this transit corridor.

**Comment 156:** Oregon City requests that two multi-use path projects be added to the RTP project list. These projects represent links between I-205, the North/South transit corridor, and downtown Oregon City. These multi-use paths are included in the Metro Greenspaces Master Plan. The projects are:

- The Clackamas River multi-use path between I-205 and Clackamette Park; and
- The Willamette River multi-use path between the Clackamas River multi-use path at Clackamette Park and Smurfit at McLoughlin Boulevard and 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

(Oregon City, 5/1/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 156:** Amend as requested. Add the projects to the Regional Bicycle System map (Figure 1.18) as proposed regional off-street corridor, and to the Regional Pedestrian System map as a proposed multi-use facility with pedestrian transportation function. Add the projects and descriptions to the Priority System in Chapter 5 and in Appendix 1.1.

**Comment 157:** Remove the extension of Marine Drive from the I-84 frontage road to Halsey Street in Troutdale. (Troutdale City Council, 5/24/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 157:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 158:** Reconsider proposed design of Project #1184 to improve safety of the intersection. (Gordon Trapp, 5/9/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 158:** No change recommended. This comment is a local project design issue.

## Miscellaneous Comments

**Comment 159:** The urban growth boundary in Clackamas County must be expanded to improve the job/house balance in this part of the region, and the ability of transportation facilities to adequately serve the area (Clackamas Co. Economic Development Commission, 6/15/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 159:** No change recommended. The job/housing balance issue will be addressed as part of the TCSP planning process that will establish a land use and transportation concept for emerging urban areas in the Pleasant Valley/Damascus portion of Clackamas County.

**Comment 160:** There are several places in the Legal Refinements document that still refer to the Strategic (e.g., Page 15 #2 and #3 proposed revisions), and the RTP Project List. The legal refinement document and all RTP appendices and project lists will need to be revised accordingly. (City of Beaverton, 5/10/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 160:** Amend as requested.

**Comment 161:** Supports the need for early completion of Phase One of the Sunrise Corridor. The South Corridor Project must remain as the important project in the RTP linking Clackamas County and the Central City. The Metro Council should start the process for a study of the needs and options for transportation along the I-205 Corridor. (Rock Creek CPO, 6/27/00 and Clackamas County and Dick Jones, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 161:** No change recommended. Sunrise Corridor and South Corridor Transportation Alternatives Project are in the Financially Constrained system. A number of projects related to the I-205 and Highway 99E/224 corridors in Clackamas County are included in the Strategic system. In addition, Section 6.7.6 in Chapter 6 of the RTP identifies a study to further define the needs and options for transportation in the I-205 corridor.

**Comment 162:** Revise Project 3143 (widening Walker Road to five lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes) to reflect a three-lane cross section with sidewalks and bike lanes. (Matt Palmer, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 162:** No change recommended. This is a local project design issue that will be considered as part of the Washington County Transportation System Plan update. This comment will be forwarded to Washington County staff for consideration as part of their TSP update.

**Comment 163:** Pedestrian islands along McLoughlin Boulevard at Hull, Boardman, Vineyard and Risley roads need additional illuminated crossing signs that are push-button activated to improve pedestrian safety. (John Hepler, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 163:** No change recommended. This is a local project design issue. This comment will be forwarded to ODOT for consideration.

**Comment 164:** Project 1263 (Banfield Pedestrian improvements) should include a stairway on the west side of the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue viaduct. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 164:** This project recognizes the need for pedestrian improvements at or near light rail stations in the Banfield corridor. Specific improvements will be determined during project development, which will include outreach to affected citizens. This comment will be forwarded to Tri-Met and the City of Portland for their consideration when project development begins.

**Comment 165:** The RTP should designate in the text description of project 1051 - Burnside Street Traffic Management Improvements, the inclusion of a Burnside - Couch Street couplet between NW Eighth and 19<sup>th</sup> Avenues due to limited right-of-way on Burnside. The project should be extended from SE 12<sup>th</sup> to SE 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 165:** There are no specific designs for this project at this time, only a recognized need to provide boulevard type improvements in this area. This comment

will be forwarded to the City of Portland for consideration during the project design phase. It is not recommended to extend the project to SE 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue at this time due to the increase in costs.

**Comment 166:** Project 1119; Sandy/Burnside intersection improvements should remove Sandy Boulevard between Washington and Ankeny Streets and improve SE Seventh between Washington and Burnside to be a two-way local collector with signals at Seventh and Burnside. (Douglas Kelso, 6/29/00)

**TPAC Recommendation on Comment 166:** There are no specific designs for this project at this time, only a recognized need to provide boulevard type improvements in this area. This comment will be forwarded to the City of Portland for consideration during the project design phase.