

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



METRO

Date: July 26, 1996
To: JPACT Members
From: TPAC Members
Subject: Title 2 and Title 6 of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* (dated July 10, 1996)

Over the past few months, TPAC has been reviewing the proposed *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* as it moves through the adoption process. As a result of our review, we recommend Metro Council adoption of Title 2 and Title 6 of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* with the following two revisions described below.

First, we recommend the following amendments be made to Title 6, Section 4.B. and Section 4.C., Transportation Performance Standards, pages 22-23:

2. Accessibility. If a congestion standard is exceeded as identified in 4.A.B.1, local governments shall evaluate the impact of the congestion on regional accessibility using the best available methods (quantitative or qualitative). If a determination is made by Metro that the congestion negatively impacts regional accessibility, local jurisdictions shall follow the congestion management procedures identified in 4.BC., below.

BC. Congestion Management

Prior to recommending a significant capacity expansion to a regional facility, or including such an expansion in a city or county comprehensive plan, the following actions shall be applied, unless adequately addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan:

Second, the record accompanying the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* should clarify three issues: (1) the effect of the functional plan on local jurisdictions; (2) the effect of the functional plan on regional transportation funding policies; and (3) the relationship of the

functional plan to issues that will be addressed in the upcoming *Regional Transportation Plan* update. To address our concerns about these issues, we propose that the following explanatory text accompany adoption of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Title 6, Section 4.A.1. requires local governments to set a non-Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) mode split target for the central city and for each of the regional centers and station communities within their jurisdictional boundaries. The *Regional Transportation Plan* will set those regional mode split targets as part of the *Regional Transportation Plan* update. However, the expectation is that local governments will begin establishing these mode split targets and identifying methods to meet the targets effective the date of adoption of the *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan* rather than wait for completion of the *Regional Transportation Plan* update.

Upon completion of the *Regional Transportation Plan* update, Metro will propose for adoption non-SOV mode split targets as well as actions to achieve those targets (e.g., bicycle/pedestrian elements and transportation demand management actions such as ridesharing or vanpool programs). Once Metro has adopted these targets, local governments will be expected to meet the minimum non-SOV mode split targets. A local government may exceed these minimum targets as a local option.

Relating to finance priorities, past financing criteria has distinguished between projects of regional significance and projects of local significance. While both types of projects are eligible for regional funds, there has typically been an emphasis on projects of regional significance. To this end, projects that work toward achieving the regional non-SOV mode split targets will be considered to be of regional significance. Projects that are aimed at surpassing the regional non-SOV mode split targets will be considered to be of local significance.

Title 6, Section 4.B. contains level-of-service (LOS) standards that are allowed, but not required, in the instances where densities are proposed to increase in the central city, regional centers, town centers, main streets and station communities. This LOS standard is a change from existing requirements in the current *Regional Transportation Plan* and the *Oregon Transportation Plan*. In order to utilize the LOS standard, as proposed in Title 6, Metro will request a waiver from the Oregon Transportation Commission.

In addition, as part of the *Regional Transportation Plan* update, Metro will continue evaluating alternative transportation systems based on alternative LOS standards. For this reason, the conclusion on what the LOS standard will be for the entire region shall be established through adoption of the updated *Regional Transportation Plan*. This evaluation may result in a change to Title 6, Section 4.B. of the *Urban Growth Management Function Plan*.

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan
A functional plan for early implementation of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept

Introduction

Metro was created after a vote of the citizens of the region as an elected regional government responsible for addressing issues of regional significance in the metropolitan area and is enabled by state law, adopted by the Oregon Legislature in 1977. In addition, the voters of the region adopted a Metro Charter in 1992, which describes additional responsibilities for the agency. Metro has an elected Executive Officer and a Metro Council which propose and determine region-wide policies.

The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) is comprised of local government elected officials and appointed citizens from throughout the region and was created to advise the regionally elected Metro Council on matters of metropolitan significance. MPAC was included in the Metro Charter, which was adopted by a vote of the citizens of the metropolitan area. MPAC has recommended specific policies to be included in a new functional plan to be adopted by the Metro Council as soon as practicable. This recommendation was made by MPAC to begin implementation of the regional policies of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept as adopted by the Metro Council by Ordinance No. 95-625-A. Early implementation is intended to take advantage of opportunities now and avoid land use inconsistent with the long-term growth policy.

MPAC, as well as the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and the Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) have made recommendations that are the basis for this functional plan. All of the elements considered by MPAC, JPACT and WRPAC were deemed by the Metro Council to be of metropolitan significance. The following text states the scope of regional policies, which will apply to all 24 cities and 3 counties within the Metro region for early implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. The legal form of this early implementation is a functional plan, not adoption as a "component" of the Regional Framework Plan. The policies in this functional plan will be coordinated with policies to be readopted in official components of the Metro Charter mandated Regional Framework Plan, on or before December 30, 1997.

Functional plans are a primary regional policy tool that may contain both "recommendations" and "requirements" for changes in local plans. This functional plan relies on further actions, primarily changes to local government comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, to effectuate the actions described below.

31 **The Meaning of Regional Functional Plan Adoption**

32 The following regional policies recommend and require changes to city and county plans to
33 implement regional goals and objectives constituting the Urban Growth Management
34 Functional Plan under ORS 268.390, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives
35 (RUGGO), Goal I, and Resolution No.96-2288. The requirements for plan changes, including
36 implementing regulations, shall be adopted by all cities and counties in the Metro region
37 within twenty-four (24) months from the effective date of this ordinance.

38 Local determination not to incorporate required functional plan policies into comprehensive
39 plans shall be subject to the conflict resolution and mediation processes included within the
40 RUGGO, Goal I provisions prior to the final adoption of inconsistent policies or actions.
41 Local actions inconsistent with functional plan requirements are subject to appeal for violation
42 of the functional plan.

43 **Regional Policy Basis**

44 The regional policies described below are formulated from, and are consistent with, the
45 RUGGOs, including the Metro 2040 Growth Concept. These adopted Metro policies will be
46 incorporated into the Regional Framework Plan. Also, the overall principles of the
47 Greenspaces Master Plan are incorporated.

48 In addition, the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)¹, when adopted, will serve as the
49 transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. It will be the primary transportation
50 policy implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept. However, early implementation land use
51 policies in this functional plan are integrated with early implementation transportation policies
52 derived from preparation of the 1996 Regional Transportation Plan, and consistent with the
53 Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

54 **Structure of Requirements**

55 The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan is a regional functional plan which contains
56 "requirements" ~~that are binding~~ on cities and counties of the region as well as recommendations
57 ~~that are not binding~~. "Shall" or other directive words are used with requirements. The words
58 "should" or "may" are used with recommendations. The Plan is structured so that local
59 jurisdictions may pick from either performance standard requirements or prescriptive
60 requirements. The intent is to write these regulations so that local jurisdictions have a
61 significant amount of flexibility as to how they meet requirements. Performance standards are
62 included in all titles. If local jurisdictions can show that they meet the performance standard,

¹ Metro has an adopted Regional Transportation Plan. However, because of changing local and regional conditions, as well as state and federal requirements, the RTP is being amended in 1996.

63 they have met the requirement of the title. In addition, prescriptive standards are also
64 included. They are available to show one very specific way that jurisdictions may meet the
65 title requirement, but are not the only way a city or county may show compliance.

Regional Functional Plan Requirements

**TITLE 1: REQUIREMENTS FOR HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT
ACCOMMODATION**

Section 1. Intent

State law and Metro code require that the Metro urban growth boundary (UGB) have sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected growth for 20 years. It is Metro policy to minimize the amount of urban growth boundary expansion required for the expected population and employment growth by the year 2017 consistent with all Statewide Goals. It is beneficial and desirable to increase the density permitted for development and to increase the actual built density within the UGB consistent with the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

**Section 2. Local Plan Accommodation of Fair Share Capacity Housing and Employment
- Performance Standard**

Local governments, by the methods proscribed in sections 3 through 6 of this title, shall demonstrate that:

- A. Their zoning and other regulations will permit the growth capacity contained in Section 3 of this Title to be built consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept target densities for each center, corridor, station community, main street, industrial and employment areas and inner and outer neighborhood; and
- B. Effective measures have been taken to reasonably assure that the growth capacity will be built for housing units and employment.

Minimum density standards shall be applied for residential units so that the target densities shall be achieved. The minimum density standards shall be no less than 80 percent of maximum residential densities, except for high density zones with maximum permitted density higher than 37 dwelling units per net acre. For these zones, the minimum density shall be at least 30 dwelling units per net acre if such provisions are consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept designations mapped for the area.

Local governments shall permit the expected development at densities likely to be achieved during the planning period by the private market or assisted housing programs, once all new regulations are in effect. The permitted densities shall be within the 2040 Growth Concept target densities indicated in footnote 2 of Table 1.

96 Metro will work with local jurisdictions to develop a set of region-wide community
97 development code provisions, standards and other regulations which local jurisdictions may
98 adopt that will help implement the 2040 Growth Concept and this Functional Plan.

99 Included in this project will be a review of development standards in support of smaller lots
100 and more flexible use of land, strategies to encourage land assembly, more flexible zoning and
101 improvements in the pre-application process to ensure timely and thorough review and to
102 provide for early involvement by the public to address neighborhood concerns and assure
103 community acceptance of these changes.

104 Section 3. Expected Growth Capacity for Local Governments within the Metro Boundary

105 The expected Livable Capacity for Housing Units and Employment is contained in the
106 Appendix and labeled Table 1. These include jurisdiction-wide expected capacities, as well as
107 capacities for mixed use areas (which include the Central City, Regional Centers, Town
108 Centers, Station Area and Main Streets) and capacity for Station Communities. Local plan and
109 zoning provisions may permit or require development at densities which exceed the 2040
110 Growth Concept target densities and the Expected Livable Share Capacity listed on Table 1, if
111 such provisions are otherwise consistent with the 2040 land use types described in the Growth
112 Concept.

113 Section 4. Review of Permitted Capacity of Housing Units and Employment

114 The purpose of this review is to determine the capacity of existing comprehensive plans and
115 implementing ordinances to accommodate housing and employment and to determine whether
116 amendments to existing plans are necessary to comply with Section 6A of this Title. All cities
117 and counties within the Metro region are hereby required to:

118 A. Review the permitted capacity² of their current comprehensive plans, and calculate the
119 expected capacity of housing units and employment by the year 2017. These estimates
120 shall be conducted using the following method:

- 121
- 122 1. Local governments shall use Metro estimates of vacant land, and land likely to
123 redevelop, unless the local government has data that it believes is more accurate.
124 In this case, the local government may provide Metro the following:

- 125 a. The source of the data;

² See Title 8, Definitions, "permitted capacity" and "expected capacity."

- 126 b. The reasons that the locally developed data is a more accurate estimate
127 than the Metro estimate of vacant and redevelopable land;
128 c. The database from which the above were derived;
129 d. The database of committed development lands.

130 Local governments may use their data, subject to acceptance by the Metro Council
131 or their designee, after Metro determination as to which data is more accurate.
132

- 133 2. In estimating expected capacity of existing comprehensive plans and
134 implementing ordinances, local governments shall not estimate expected
135 capacity at more than 80 percent of maximum permitted density, unless:
136
137 a. actual experience in the jurisdiction since 1990 has shown that development
138 has occurred at density greater than 80 percent of permitted residential
139 density or can be demonstrated, or
140 b. minimum density standards are adopted or proposed for adoption in the
141 zoning code that require residential development at greater than 80 percent
142 of maximum permitted density.

143 c. Jurisdictions calculating capacity through the use of density bonus provisions
144 consider transfers, including off-site transfers, upon demonstration of previous
145 approvals of density transfers, or on-site transfers if within the past 5 years
146 underbuild rate have been at 79 percent or greater than maximum permitted
147 densities.

148 B. Local governments shall determine the effect of each of the following on its overall
149 development capacity:
150

- 151 1. required dedications for public streets, consistent with the Regional Accessibility
152 Title;
153
154 2. off-street parking, consistent with this plan;
155
156 3. landscaping, setback, and maximum lot coverage requirements;
157
158 4. the effects of tree preservation ordinances, environmental protection ordinances,
159 view preservation ordinances, solar access ordinances, or any other regulations
160 that may have the effect of reducing the capacity of the land to develop at the
161 permitted density;
162
163 5. the effects of areas dedicated to bio-swales, storm water retention, open space
164 dedications, and other requirements of local codes that may reduce the capacity
165 of the land to develop at the permitted density.

Section 5. Procedures for Jurisdictions without Sufficient Capacity

If the permitted and expected capacity estimates developed under Section 4 are less than the jurisdiction's growth capacity for housing, employment, or both, then the jurisdiction is hereby required to amend its comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances. The amendments shall make the comprehensive plan consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept target densities ranges in footnote 2 of Table 1 and they shall provide for the expected capacitycapacities for population and employment contained in Section 3 of this Title. Exceptions can be made according to Title 8. The capacity calculation shall be made according to the same methodology the jurisdiction used in Section 4. The jurisdiction shall demonstrate at least the following in providing capacitycapacities for housing and employment:

- A. The permitted densities are at locations and densities that the market is likely to build during the planning period; and
- B. The capacity calculation used only those development types that are a permitted use in the development code. Any discretionary decision must not diminish the permitted density if it is to be counted as a part of expected capacity; and
- C. Expected capacity has been determined by accounting for all public requirements that may have the effect of reducing capacity, including those listed in Section 4.B above; and
- D. Local governments have reviewed their public facility capacities and plans and have, or can provide, planned public facilities to accommodate growth within the plan period; and
- E. Local governments permit partitioning or subdividing in those urban areas of the city or county where existing lot sizes are two or more times that of the minimum lot size of local jurisdiction zoning.

195 Section 6F. Local governments have considered one or more of the tools listed in Section 6B
196 1-6.

197 **Section 6. Procedures for Jurisdictions with Sufficient Current Capacity**

198 If a city or county within the Metro region finds that their current plans and ordinances
199 provide for capacity equal to or greater than that required under Section 3 for housing units or
200 employment or both, then the city or county is hereby required to compare the 1990-1995
201 actual built densities within their jurisdiction with permitted densities for housing units and
202 employment. This comparison shall be conducted using the following methods:
203

- 204 A. Residential and employment developments to be analyzed shall be those which were
205 permitted by a land use action and constructed during the period from 1990 to 1995,
206 and residential density shall be measured in households per net developed acre.³
207 Employment performance shall be measured by comparing the actual jurisdiction-wide
208 increase during the years 1990-1995 with the jurisdiction-wide increase listed in Table
209 1. This shall include only those developments that received approval under the
210 implementing ordinances during this period.
211
- 212 B. If the average of actual built densities for 1990-1995 is less than 80 percent of
213 permitted densities, cities and counties shall amend their plans and implementing
214 ordinances, if necessary to meet the performance standard, and demonstrate how the
215 actual expected capacity in Table 1 will be achieved. — Section 2 of this Title requires
216 the use of minimum residential density requirements to achieve expected capacity.
217 Examples of other measures include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 218 1. Financial incentives for higher density housing;
 - 219 2. Provisions permitting additional density beyond that generally allowed in the
220 zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the
221 developer;
 - 222 3. Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures;
 - 223 4. Redevelopment and infill strategies;
 - 224 5. Authorization of housing types not previously allowed by the plan or
225 regulations; and
226
 - 227 6. Adoption of an average residential density standard.

³ See definitions.

228 C. If the average of actual built densities for 1990-1995 is 80 percent or greater than
229 permitted densities, the city or county shall provide to Metro their findings and data.
230 No change to a city or county plan or implementing ordinance shall be required.

TITLE 2: REGIONAL PARKING POLICY

Section 1. Intent

The State's Transportation Planning rule calls for per capita reductions of vehicle miles traveled and parking as a means of responding to transportation and land use impacts of growth. The Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for more compact development as a means to encourage more efficient use of land, promote non-auto trips and protect air quality. In addition, the federally mandated air quality plan relies on the 2040 Growth Concept fully achieving its transportation objectives. Notably, it relies upon reducing vehicle trips per capita and related parking spaces through minimum and maximum parking ratios. This title is provided to address these statutory requirements and preserve the quality of life of the region.

A compact urban form requires that each use of land is carefully considered and that more efficient forms are favored over less efficient ones. Parking, especially that provided in new developments, can result in a less efficient land usage and lower floor to area ratios. Parking also has implications for transportation. In areas where transit is provided or other non-auto modes (walking, biking) are convenient, less parking can be provided and still allow accessibility and mobility for all modes, including autos. Reductions in auto trips when substituted by non-auto modes can reduce congestion and increase air quality.

Section 2. Performance Standard

A. Local Governments are hereby required to adopt amendments, if necessary, to insure that their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations meet or exceed the following minimum standards:

1. Require no more parking than the minimum as shown on Regional Parking Standards Table, attached hereto; and
2. Establish parking maximums at ratios no greater than those listed in the Parking Table and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum Map. The designation of A and B zones on the Parking Maximum Map should be reviewed every five years and if necessary, revised to reflect changes in public transportation and in pedestrian support from adjacent neighborhoods. For all urban areas outside Zone A, cities and counties shall establish parking space maximums no greater than those listed in Zone B in the Parking Table and as illustrated in the Parking Maximum map. Local governments should designate Zone A parking ratios in areas with good pedestrian access to commercial or employment areas (within 1/3 mile walk) from adjacent residential areas.
3. Establish ~~Ensure that~~ an administrative or public hearing process for considering ratios for individual or joint developments that ~~are~~ allow adjustment for parking when:

268
269
270
271
272

- a. in excess of the maximum parking ratios; and
 - b. less than the minimum parking ratios.
- Local governments may grant an adjustment from maximum parking ratios or minimum parking ratios through an adjustment or variance process.

273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282

- B. Free surface parking spaces shall be subject to the regional parking maximums. Parking spaces in parking structures, fleet parking, parking for vehicles that are for sale, lease, or rent, employee car pool parking spaces, dedicated valet parking spaces, spaces that are user paid, market rate parking or other high-efficiency parking management alternatives may be exempted from maximum parking standards. Sites that are proposed for redevelopment may be allowed to phase in reductions as a local option. Where mixed land uses are proposed, local governments shall provide for blended parking rates. It is recommended that local governments count adjacent on-street parking spaces, nearby public parking and shared parking toward required parking minimum standards.

283
284
285

- C. Local Governments may use categories or measurement standards other than those in the Parking Table, but must provide findings that the effect of the local regulations will be substantially the same as the application of the Regional Parking Ratios.

286
287

- D. Local governments shall monitor and provide the following data to Metro on an annual basis:

288
289
290
291
292
293

1. the number and location of newly developed parking spaces, and
2. demonstration of compliance with the minimum and maximum parking standards, including the application of any local adjustments to the regional standards in this title. Coordination with Metro collection of other building data should be encouraged.

294 **TITLE 3: WATER QUALITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION**

295 **Section 1. Intent**

296 To protect the beneficial uses and functional values of resources within the Water Quality and
297 Flood Management Areas by limiting or mitigating the impact on these areas from development
298 activities.

299 **Section 2. Requirement**

300 Cities and counties shall ensure that their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations
301 protect Water Quality and Flood Management Areas pursuant to Section 4 . Exceptions to this
302 requirement will be considered under the provisions of Section 7.

303 **Section 3. Implementation Process for Local Governments**

304 Cities and counties are hereby required to amend their plans and implementing ordinances, if
305 necessary, to ensure that they comply with this Title in one of the following ways:

306
307 A. Either adopt the relevant provisions of the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management
308 model ordinance and map entitled Metro Water Quality and Flood Management
309 Conservation Area Map; or

310 B. Demonstrate that the plans and implementing ordinances substantially comply with the
311 performance standards, including the map, contained in Section 4. In this case, the
312 purpose of this map is to provide a performance standard for evaluation of substantial
313 compliance for those jurisdictions who choose to development their own map of water
314 quality and flood management areas ; or

315 C. Any combination of A and B above that substantially complies with all performance
316 standards in Section 4.

317 **Section 4. Performance Standards**

318 A. **Flood Mitigation.** The purpose of these standards is to protect against flooding, and
319 prevent or reduce risk to human life and properties, by allowing for the storage and
320 conveyance of stream flows through these natural systems.

321 The plans and implementing ordinances of cities and counties shall be in substantial compliance
322 with the following performance standards:

323

- 324 1. Prohibit development within the water quality and flood management area; or
325 2. Limit development in a manner that requires balanced cut and fill; unless
326 the project is demonstrated, by an engineering study, it will have a net
327 beneficial effect on flood mitigation.
328 3. Require minimum finished floor elevations at least one foot above the design
329 flood height or other applicable flood hazard standard for new habitable
330 structures in the Water Quality and Flood Management Area.
331 4. Require that temporary fills permitted during construction shall be removed.

332 B. Water Quality. The purpose of these standards is to protect and allow for enhancement
333 of water quality associated with beneficial uses as defined by the Oregon Water
334 Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

335 The plans and implementing ordinances of cities and counties shall be in substantial compliance
336 with the following performance standards:

- 337 1. Require erosion and sediment control for all new development within the Metro
338 boundary as contained in the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management model
339 ordinance.
340 2. Require to the maximum extent practicable that native vegetation cover is
341 maintained or re-established during development, and that trees and shrubs in the
342 Water Quality and Flood Management Area are maintained. The vegetative cover
343 required pursuant to these provisions shall not allow the use of "Prohibited Plants
344 for Stream Corridors and Wetlands" contained in the Water Quality and Flood
345 Management Model Code adopted by the Metro Council.
346 3. Prohibit new uses of uncontained areas of hazardous materials as defined by DEQ
347 in the Water Quality and Flood Management Areas; and
348

349 C. Protect the long term regional continuity and integrity of Water Quality and Flood
350 Management Areas

351 Standards: Local jurisdictions shall establish or adopt transfer of density within ownership
352 to mitigate the effects of development in Water Quality and Flood Management Areas, or
353 through Transferable Development Rights (TDRs), which have substantially equivalent
354 effect as the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management Model Ordinance.
355

Metro encourages local government to require that approvals of applications for partitions, subdivisions and design review actions must be conditioned with protecting Water Quality and Flood Management Areas with a conservation easement, platted as a common open space, or through purchase or donation of fee simple ownership to public agencies or private non-profits for preservation where feasible. Metro and local governments shall recognize that applications involving pre-existing development within the Water Quality and Flood Management Areas shall be exempted from the provisions concerning conservation easement.

Section 5. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area

A. The purpose of these standards is to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife habitat within the fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas identified on the water quality and flood management area map by establishing performance standards and promoting coordination by Metro of regional urban water sheds.

B. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area Recommendations

These areas shall be shown on the Water Quality and Flood Management Area Map. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas generally include and/or go beyond the Water Quality and Flood Management Areas. These areas shown on the map are Metro's initial inventory of significant fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. Metro hereby recommends that local jurisdictions adopt the following temporary standards:

1. Prohibit development in the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas that adversely impacts fish and wildlife habitat.

Exceptions:

- a. Utility construction where no reasonable, feasible alternative exists within a maximum construction zone width established by local governments.
- b. Overhead or underground electric power, telecommunications and cable television lines within a sewer or stormwater right-of-way or within a maximum construction zone width established by local governments.
- c. Trails, boardwalks and viewing areas construction. Local jurisdictions will determine mitigation or equivalent widening of the protected corridor, especially for paved paths.

2. Limit the clearing or removal of native vegetation from the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area to ensure its long term survival and health. Allow and encourage enhancement and restoration projects for the benefit of fish and wildlife.

391 3. Require the revegetation of disturbed areas with native plants to 90 percent cover
392 within three years. Disturbed areas should be replanted with native plants on the
393 Metro Plant List or an approved locally adopted plant list. Planting or propagation
394 of plants listed on the Metro Prohibited Plant List within the Conservation Area
395 shall be prohibited.

396 4. Require compliance with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
397 seasonal restrictions for in-stream work. Limit development activities that would
398 impair fish and wildlife during key life-cycle events according to the guidelines
399 contained in ODFW's "Oregon Guidelines for Timing of In-water Work to Protect
400 Fish and Wildlife Resources."

401 C. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection

402 Within eighteen (18) months from the effective date of this functional plan, Metro shall complete
403 the following regional coordination program by adoption of functional plan provisions.

404 1. Metro shall establish criteria to define and identify regionally significant fish and
405 wildlife habitat areas.

406 2. Metro shall adopt a map of regionally significant fish and wildlife areas after (1)
407 examining existing Goal 5 data, reports and regulation from cities and counties,
408 and (2) holding public hearings.

409 3. Metro shall identify inadequate or inconsistent data and protection in existing Goal
410 5 data, reports and regulations on fish and wildlife habitat. City and county
411 comprehensive plan provisions where inventories of significant resources were
412 completed and accepted by a LCDC Periodic Review Order after January 1, 1993,
413 shall not be required to comply until their next periodic review.

414 4. Metro shall complete Goal 5 economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE)
415 analyses for mapped regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat areas only for
416 those areas where inadequate or inconsistent data or protection has been identified.
417

418 5. Metro shall establish performance standards for protection of regionally significant
419 fish and wildlife habitat which must be met by the plans implementing ordinances
420 of cities and counties.

421 Section 6. Metro Model Ordinance Required

422 Metro shall adopt a Water Quality and Flood Management Model Ordinance and map for use by
423 local jurisdictions to comply with this section. Sections 1-4 of this title shall not become effective
424 until 24 months after Metro Council has adopted a Model Code and map that addresses all of the
425 provisions of this title. Metro may adopt a Model Code and map for protection of regionally
426 significant fish and wildlife habitat. Section 5 of this title shall be implemented by adoption of
427 new functional plan provisions.

428
429 **Section 7. Variances**

430 City and county comprehensive plans and implementing regulations are hereby required to
431 include procedures to consider claims of map error and hardship variances to reduce or remove
432 stream corridor protection for any property demonstrated to be converted to an unbuildable lot
433 by application of stream corridor protections.

TITLE 4: RETAIL IN EMPLOYMENT AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS

Section 1. Intent

It is the intent of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept that Employment and Industrial Areas contain very little retail development. Employment and Industrial areas would be expected to include some limited retail commercial uses primarily to serve the needs of people working or living in the immediate employment areas, not larger market areas outside the employment area. Exceptions to this general policy for Employment and Industrial Areas can be made for certain areas as identified on the Employment and Industrial Areas Map.

Section 2. Comprehensive Plan and Implementing Ordinance Changes Required

Cities and counties are hereby required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing regulations to prohibit retail uses larger than 50,000 feet of gross leasable area per building or business in the Employment and Industrial Areas specifically designated on the 2040 Growth Concept Map.

Section 3. Exceptions

Exceptions to this standard may be included for:

- A. Low traffic generating, land-consumptive commercial uses with low parking demand which have a community or region wide market, or
- B. As identified on the Employment and Industrial Areas Map, specific Employment or Industrial Areas which already have substantially developed as retail centers or which have been locally designated as retail centers may allow new or redeveloped retail uses. Proposed refinements to the mapped areas ~~any~~ may be considered in local compliance plans as provided in Title 8.

TITLE 5: NEIGHBOR CITIES AND RURAL RESERVES

Section 1. Intent

The intent of this title is to clearly define Metro policy with regard to areas outside the Metro urban growth boundary. **NO PORTION OF THIS TITLE CAN REQUIRE ANY ACTIONS BY NEIGHBORING CITIES.** Metro, if neighboring cities jointly agree, will adopt or sign rural reserve agreements for those areas designated rural reserve in the Metro 2040 Growth Concept with Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington County, and Neighbor City Agreements with Sandy, Canby, and North Plains. Metro would welcome discussion about agreements with other cities if they request such agreements.

In addition, counties and cities within the Metro boundary are hereby required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances within twenty-four months to reflect the rural reserves and green corridors policies described in the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

Section 2. Metro Intent with Regard to Rural Reserves

Metro shall attempt to designate and protect common rural reserves between Metro's urban growth boundary and designated urban reserve areas and each neighbor city's urban growth boundary and designated urban reserves, and designate and protect common locations for green corridors along transportation corridors connecting the Metro region and each neighboring city. For areas within the Metro boundary, counties are hereby required to amend their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to identify and protect the rural reserves and green corridors described in the Metro 2040 Growth Concept and shown on the 2040 Growth Concept Map. For areas outside the Metro boundary, Metro shall encourage intergovernmental agreements with the cities of Sandy, Canby and North Plains.

Section 3. Invitations for Intergovernmental Agreements

Metro shall invite the local governments outside the Metro boundary and named in Section 1 of this title to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement, similar to the draft agreements attached hereto.

Section 4. Metro Intent with Regard to Green Corridors

Metro shall attempt to negotiate a Green Corridor Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the three counties (Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington) to designate and protect areas along transportation corridors connecting Metro and neighboring cities.

TITLE 6 - REGIONAL ACCESSIBILITY

Section 1. Intent

Implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept requires that the region identify key measures of transportation effectiveness which include all modes of transportation. Developing a full array of these measures will require additional analysis. Focusing development in the concentrated activity centers, including the central city, regional centers, and station communities, requires the use of alternative modes in order to avoid unacceptable levels of congestion and to insure that accessibility by alternative modes is attractive. The continued economic vitality of industrial areas and intermodal facilities is largely dependent on preserving or improving access to these areas and maintaining reasonable levels of freight mobility on the region's main throughways. Therefore, regional congestion standards and other regional system performance measures shall be tailored to reinforce the specific development needs of the individual 2040 Growth Concept land use components.

These regional standards will be linked to a series of regional street design concepts that fully integrate transportation and land use needs for each of the 2040 land use components. The designs generally form a continuum; a network of throughways (freeway and highway designs) will emphasize auto and freight mobility and connect major activity centers. Slower-speed boulevard designs within concentrated activity centers will balance the multi-modal travel demands of these areas. Street and road designs will complete the continuum, with multi-modal designs that reflect the land uses they serve, but also serving as moderate-speed vehicle connections between activity centers that complement the throughway system. While these designs are under development, it is important that improvements in the most concentrated activity centers are designed to lessen the negative effects of motor vehicle traffic on other modes of travel. Therefore, the need to implement amenity-oriented boulevard treatment that better serves pedestrian and transit travel in the central city, regional centers, main streets, town centers, and station communities is a key step in the overall implementation of the Metro 2040 Growth Concept.

Section 2. Boulevard Design

For regional routes in the central city, regional centers, station communities, main streets and town centers designated on the Boulevard Design Map, all cities and counties within the Metro region are hereby required to implement or allow to be implemented boulevard design elements as improvements are made to these facilities including those facilities built by ODOT or Tri-Met. Each jurisdiction shall adopt amendments, if necessary, to ensure that their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances require consideration or installation of the following boulevard design elements when proceeding with right-of-way improvements on regional routes designated on the boulevard design map. In general, pedestrian and transit oriented design elements are the priority in the central city and regional centers, station communities, main streets and town centers:

- 524 A. Wide sidewalks with pedestrian amenities such as benches, awnings and special
525 lighting;
- 526 B. Landscape strips, street trees and other design features that create a pedestrian buffer
527 between curb and sidewalk;
- 528 C. Pedestrian crossings at all intersections, and mid-block crossings where intersection
529 spacing is excessive;
- 530 D. The use of medians and curb extensions to enhance pedestrian crossings where wide
531 streets make crossing difficult;
- 532 E. Bikeways;
- 533 F. On-street parking;
- 534 G. Motor vehicle lane widths that consider the above improvements;
- 535 H. Use of landscaped medians where appropriate to enhance the visual quality of the
536 streetscape.

537 **Section 3. Design Standards for Street Connectivity**

538 The design of local street systems, including "local" and "collector" functional classifications,
539 is generally beyond the scope of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). However, the
540 aggregate effect of local street design impacts the effectiveness of the regional system when
541 local travel is restricted by a lack of connecting routes, and local trips are forced onto the
542 regional network. Therefore, the RTP will include design standards for connectivity aimed at
543 improving local circulation in a manner that protects the integrity of the regional system.

544 Local jurisdictions within the Metro region are hereby required to amend their comprehensive
545 plans and implementing ordinances, if necessary, to comply with or exceed one of the
546 following options in the development review process:

547 A. **Design Option.** Cities and counties shall ensure that their comprehensive plans,
548 implementing ordinances and administrative codes require demonstration of compliance
549 with the following:

- 550 1. New residential and mixed-use developments shall include local street plans
551 that:

- 552 a. encourage pedestrian travel by providing short, direct public right-of-way
553 routes to connect residential uses with nearby existing and planned
554 commercial services, schools, parks and other neighborhood facilities; and
555
556 b. include no cul-de-sac streets longer than 200 feet, and no more than 25
557 dwelling units on a closed-end street system; and

558 c. provide bike and pedestrian connections on public easements or right-of-way
559 when full street connections are not possible, with a minimum spacing of no
560 more than 330 feet; and

561 d. consider opportunities to incrementally extend and connect local streets in
562 primarily developed areas; and

563 e. serve a mix of land uses on contiguous local streets; and

564 f. support posted speed limits; and

565 g. consider narrow street design alternatives that feature ~~total right-of-way of~~
566 ~~no more than 46 feet, including pavement widths of no more than 28 feet,~~
567 ~~curb-face to curb-face, sidewalk widths of at least 5 feet and landscaped~~
568 ~~pedestrian buffer strips that include street trees; and~~

569 h. limit the use of cul-de-sac designs and closed street systems to situations
570 where topography, development patterns or environmental constraints
571 prevent full street extensions.

572 2. For new residential and mixed-use development, all contiguous areas of vacant
573 and primarily undeveloped land of five acres or more shall be identified by
574 cities and counties and the following will be prepared:

575 A map that identifies possible local street connections to adjacent developing
576 areas. The map shall include street connections at intervals of no more than
577 660 feet, with more frequent connections in areas planned for mixed use or
578 dense development.

579 B. **Performance Option.** For residential and mixed use areas, cities and counties shall
580 ensure that their comprehensive plans, implementing ordinances and administrative
581 codes require demonstration of compliance with performance criteria. Cities and
582 counties shall develop local street design maps ~~or standards~~ with street intersection
583 spacing to occur at intervals of no less than eight per mile, the number of street
584 connections coordinated and consistent with increased density and mixed land uses.

Local street designs for new developments shall satisfy both of the following additional criteria:

1. Performance Criterion: minimize local traffic on the regional motor vehicle system, by demonstrating that local vehicle trips on a given regional facility do not exceed the 1995 arithmetic median of regional trips for facilities of the same motor vehicle system classification by more than 25 percent.
2. Performance Criterion: everyday local travel needs are served by direct, connected local street systems where: (1) the shortest motor vehicle trip over public streets from a local origin to a collector or greater facility is no more than twice the straight-line distance; and (2) the shortest pedestrian trip on public right-of-way is no more than one and one-half the straight-line distance.

Section 4. Transportation Performance Standards

A. Alternative Mode Analysis

1. Mode split will be used as the key regional measure for transportation effectiveness in the Central City, Regional Centers and Station Communities. Each jurisdiction shall establish a mode split target (defined as the percentage of all non-Single Occupant Vehicle modes of transportation) for each of the central city, regional centers and station communities within its boundaries. The mode split target shall be no less than the regional targets for these Region 2040 Growth Concept land use components to be established in the Regional Transportation Plan).

2. Local Governments which have Central City, regional centers and station communities shall identify actions which will implement the mode split targets. These actions should include consideration of the maximum parking ratios adopted as part of Title 2, Section 2, Boulevard - Design of this title, and transit's role in serving the area.

B. Motor Vehicle Congestion Analysis

1. Level-of-service. The following table may be incorporated into local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to replace current methods of determining congestion on regional facilities, if this change is needed to permit Metro 2040 Growth Concept implementation in the Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers, Main Streets and Station Communities:

General Performance Standards (using LOS)*

	Preferred	Acceptable	Exceeds
Mid-Day one-hour	C or better	D	E or worse

617		Peak two-hour	E/E or better	F/E	F/F or worse
618		*Level-of-Service is determined by using either the latest edition of the Highway Capacity			
619		Manual (Transportation Research Board) or through volume to capacity ratio equivalencies			
620		as follows: LOS C = .8 or better, LOS D = .8 to .9; LOS E = .9 to 1.0; and LOS F = greater than 1.0.			
621	2.	Accessibility. If a congestion standard is exceeded as identified in 4.A.1, local			
622		governments shall evaluate the impact of the congestion on regional accessibility			
623		using the best available methods (quantitative or qualitative). If a determination is			
624		made that the congestion negatively impacts regional accessibility, local jurisdictions			
625		shall follow the congestion management procedures identified in 4.B, below.			
626	B.	Congestion Management			
627		Prior to recommending a significant capacity expansion to a regional facility, or including			
628		such an expansion in a city or county comprehensive plan, the following actions shall be			
629		applied:			
630					
631					
632					
633	1.	To address Level of Service:			
634		a. Transportation system management techniques			
635		b. Corridor or site-level transportation demand management techniques			
636		c. Additional roadway capacity to parallel facilities, including the consideration of a			
637		grid pattern consistent with connectivity standards contained in Title 6 of this plan			
638		d. Transit service improvements to increase ridership			
639	2.	To address preservation of street function:			
640		a. Traffic calming			
641		b. Street function classification			
642	3.	To address or preserve existing street capacity			
643		a. Transportation management (e.g. access management, signal interties, lane			
644		channelization)			
645					
646		If the above considerations do not adequately and cost-effectively address the problem,			
647		capacity improvements may be included in the comprehensive plan.			

648 **TITLE 7: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

649 **Section 1. Intent**

650 RUGGO Objective 17 requires Metro to use a "fair share" strategy to meet housing needs, which
651 includes housing densities supportive of "development of the regional transportation system and
652 designated centers and corridors," like Title I, above. Two other parts of the "fair share" strategy
653 are addressed here: (1) encouraging use of tools identified to improve availability of sufficient
654 housing affordable to households of all income levels; and (2) encouraging manufactured housing
655 to assure a diverse range of available housing types.

656 **Section 2. Recommendations to Improve Availability of Affordable Housing**

657 The following tools and approaches to facilitate the development of affordable housing are
658 recommended to begin to meet the need for sufficient and affordable housing:

- 659 A. Donate buildable tax-foreclosed properties to nonprofit organizations for development as
660 mixed market affordable housing
- 661 B. Develop permitting process incentives for housing being developed to serve people at or
662 below 80% of area median income.
- 663 C. Provide fee waivers and property tax exemptions for projects developed by nonprofit
664 organizations serving people at or below 60% of area median income.
- 665 D. Create a land banking program to enhance the availability of appropriate sites for
666 permanently affordable housing.
- 667 E. Consider replacement ordinances that would require developers of high-income housing,
668 commercial, industrial, recreational or government projects to replace any affordable
669 housing destroyed by these projects.
- 670 F. Consider linkage programs that require developers of job-producing development,
671 particularly that which receives tax incentives, to contribute to an affordable housing fund.
- 672 G. Commit locally controlled funds, such as Community Development Block Grants, SIP tax
673 abatement funds or general fund dollars, to the development of permanently affordable
674 housing for people at or below 60% of area median income.
- 675 H. Consider inclusionary zoning requirements, particularly in tax incentive programs, for new
676 development in transit zones and other areas where public investment has contributed to
677 the value and developability of land.

678 **Section 3. Recommendations to Encourage Manufactured Housing**

679 State housing policy requires the provision of manufactured housing inside all Urban Growth
680 Boundaries as part of the housing mix with appropriate placement standards. The following are
681 recommended to reduce regulatory barriers to appropriately placed manufactured housing:

- 682 A. Requirements for a minimum of five acres to develop a manufactured housing park should
683 be reviewed to consider a lesser requirement, such as a minimum lot size of two acres.
684
685 B. Single family duplexes and triplexes should be encouraged outside manufactured dwelling
686 parks where zoning densities are consistent with single story development.

687 **TITLE 8: COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES**

688 **Section 1. Compliance Required**

689 All local governments within the Metro boundary are hereby required to amend their
690 comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to comply with the provisions of this
691 functional plan within twenty-four months of the effective date of this ordinance. Metro
692 recommends the adoption of the components that affect land consumption as soon as possible.

693 **Section 2. Compliance Procedures**

694 A. On or before six months prior to the deadline established in Section 1, local
695 governments shall transmit to Metro the following:

- 696 1. An evaluation of their local plans, including public facility capacities and the
697 amendments necessary to comply with this functional plan;
- 698 2. Copies of all applicable comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances and
699 public facility plans, as proposed to be amended;
- 700 3. Findings that explain how the amended local comprehensive plans will achieve
701 the standards required in titles 1 through 6 of this functional plan.

702 In developing its compliance plan, the local jurisdiction shall address the Metro 2040
703 Growth Concept, and explain how the compliance plan implements the Growth
704 Concept.

705 B. Exemptions from all or any portion of any of the above titles may be granted by the
706 Metro Council, as provided for in the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives,
707 Section 5.3, after MPAC review, based on city or county submittal as specified in this
708 section.

709 1. **Population and Employment Capacity**

- 710 a. A demonstration of substantial evidence of the economic infeasibility to
711 provide sanitary sewer, water, stormwater or transportation facilities to an
712 area or areas; or

- 713 b. Substantial areas that have prior commitments to development at densities
714 inconsistent with Metro growth targets; or
- 715 c. The households and employment growth capacity cannot be accommodated
716 at densities or locations the market or assisted programs will likely build
717 during the planning period; and
- 718 d. The amount of households or employment that cannot be accommodated;
719 and
- 720 e. A recommendation for where the unaccommodated growth could be located
721 adjacent to the city or county. Metro, along with local governments, shall
722 estimate the cost of providing public services and compare those with
723 estimated costs in section 2.b.1.a.
- 724 2. Parking Measures. Subject to the provisions of Title 2, local jurisdictions may
725 request relief from the parking measures. Metro may consider a local
726 government request to allow areas from Zone A to be subject to Zone B
727 maximum parking ratio where they can demonstrate:
- 728 a. No plans for transit service with 20-minute or lower peak frequencies; and
- 729 b. No adjacent neighborhoods close enough to generate sufficient pedestrian
730 activity; and
- 731 c. No significant pedestrian activity within the present business district.
- 732 The burden of proof for adjustments shall increase as the quality and timing of
733 transit service improves. Any adjustment granted must include a demonstration
734 of how future conversion of excess parking is feasible.
- 735 3. Water Quality and Flood Management Areas. Cities and counties may request
736 areas to be added or deleted from the Metro Water Quality and Flood
737 Management Area based on a finding that the area identified on the map is not a
738 Water Quality and Flood Management Area or a Fish and Wildlife Habitat
739 Conservation Area, as defined in this functional plan. Areas may also be deleted
740 from the map if the local government can prove that its deletion and the cumulative
741 impact of all deletions in its jurisdiction will have minimal impact on the water
742 quality of the stream and on flood effects. Findings shall be supported by
743 evidence, including the results of field investigations.

744 4. Retail in Employment and Industrial Areas. Subject to the provisions of Title 4, local
745 jurisdictions may request a change in the Employment and Industrial Areas Map.
746 Metro may consider a local government request to modify a mapped Employment and
747 Industrial Area to exempt existing or locally designated retail centers, where they can
748 demonstrate that:

749 a. The map overlooked lands within a substantially developed existing retail
750 center or a locally designated retail center.

751 5. Regional Accessibility. Local jurisdictions may request relief from the requirements of
752 Title 6, Regional Accessibility, where they can show that a street system or connection
753 is not feasible for reasons of topographic constraints or natural or built environment
754 considerations.

755 C. In addition to the above procedures, local determination not to incorporate functional
756 plan policies into comprehensive plans shall be subject to the conflict resolution and
757 mediation processes included within the RUGGO, Goal I, provisions prior to the final
758 adoption of inconsistent policies or actions. Local actions inconsistent with functional
759 plan requirements are subject to appeal for violation of the functional plan.
760

761 Section 3. Any Comprehensive Plan Change must Comply

762 After the effective date of this ordinance, any change to a comprehensive plan or implementing
763 ordinance shall be consistent with the functional plan requirements contained in titles 1 through
764 8. Metro shall assist the local government in achieving compliance with all applicable
765 functional plan requirements. Upon request, Metro will review proposed comprehensive plan
766 and implementing ordinances for functional plan compliance prior to city or county adoption.

767 Section 4. Enforcement

768 City or county actions to amend a comprehensive plan or implementing ordinance in violation
769 of this functional plan shall be subject to appeal or other legal action for violation of a regional
770 functional plan requirement, including but not limited to reduction of regional transportation
771 funding and funding priorities. Prior to a final action to amend a comprehensive plan or
772 implementing ordinance, a local determination that a functional plan should not or cannot be
773 implemented shall be subject to the conflict resolution process provided for in RUGGO, Goal
774 I.

775 Section 5. Compliance Plan Assistance

- 776 A. Any local government may request of Metro a compliance plan which contains the
777 following:
- 778 1. An analysis of the local government's comprehensive plan and implementing
779 ordinances, and what sections require change to comply with the performance
780 standards.
- 781 2. Specific amendments that would bring the jurisdiction into compliance with the
782 requirements of Sections 1 to 8, if necessary.
- 783 B. Jurisdictions must make the request within four months of the effective date of this
784 ordinance. The request shall be signed by the highest elected official of the
785 jurisdiction.
- 786 C. Metro shall deliver a compliance plan within four months of the request date. The
787 compliance plan shall be a recommendation from the Executive Officer. The
788 compliance plan shall be filed with the Metro Council two weeks before it is
789 transmitted, for possible review and comment.

790 **Title 9. Benchmarks**

791 **Section 1. Intent.**

792 In order to monitor progress in implementation of this functional plan, and in order to
793 implement Objective 10 of RUGGO, Metro shall establish benchmarks related to the
794 achievement and expected outcome resulting from the implementation of this functional plan.

795 **Section 2. Benchmark Adoption**

796 A. Within six months of the adoption of this functional plan, the Metro Executive
797 Officer shall submit to the Council the Executive Officer's recommendations for
798 benchmarks to be used in evaluating the progress of the region in
799 implementation of this functional plan. The Executive Officer shall use the best
800 technology available to Metro, and shall, in addition, submit the current and
801 recent historic levels for the proposed benchmarks. The benchmarks will
802 contain both the current level of achievement, and the proposed level necessary
803 to implement this functional plan and achieve the Metro 2040 Growth Concept
804 adopted in the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO).

805 B. The Council, after receiving advice and comment from the Metropolitan Policy
806 Advisory Committee, shall adopt a list of benchmarks that will be used to
807 monitor and evaluate this functional plan. To the extent feasible, the
808 benchmarks will be published for both a regional level and by jurisdiction.

809 C. The Executive Officer shall publish an assessment of the regional performance
810 and achievement of benchmarks on a bi-annual basis.

811 D. The Benchmarks shall include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- 812 1) Amount of land converted from vacant to other uses, according to
813 jurisdiction, Growth Concept design type, and zoning;
814 2) Number and types of housing constructed, their location, density, and costs,
815 according to jurisdiction, Growth Concept design type, and zoning;
816 3) The number of new jobs created in the region, according to jurisdiction,
817 Growth Concept design type, and zoning;
818 4) The amount of development of both jobs and housing that occurred as
819 redevelopment or infill, according to jurisdiction, Growth Concept design type,
820 and zoning;
821 5) The amount of land that is environmentally sensitive that is permanently
822 protected, and the amount that is developed;
823 6) Other measures that can be reliably measured and will measure progress in
824 implementation in key areas.
825

Title 10. Definitions

Balanced cut and fill means no net increase in fill within the floodplain.

Designated Beneficial Water Uses means the same as the term as defined by the Oregon Department of Water Resources, which is: an instream public use of water for the benefit of an appropriator for a purpose consistent with the laws and the economic and general welfare of the people of the state and includes, but is not limited to, domestic, fish life, industrial, irrigation, mining, municipal, pollution abatement, power development, recreation, stockwater and wildlife uses.

Development means any manmade change defined as buildings or other structures, mining, dredging, paving, filling, or grading in amounts greater than ten (10) cubic yards on any lot or excavation. In addition, any other activity that results in the removal of more than 10% of the existing vegetated area on the lot is defined as development, for the purposes of Title 3.

Exceptions:

- a. Stream enhancement or restoration projects approved by local jurisdictions.
- b. Agricultural activity.
- c. Additions and alterations to existing structures and development that do not encroach into the Water Quality and Flood Management Area more than the existing structure or development.

DHB means the diameter of a tree measured at breast height.

DLCD Goal 5 ESEE means a decision process local governments carry out under OAR 660-23-040.

Economic infeasibility means

Expected Capacity means the density or intensity of use likely to occur on a parcel of land, commonly a density less than the permitted density.

Hazardous materials means materials described as hazardous by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area means an area defined on the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management Area Map, attached hereto. These include all Water Quality and Flood Management Areas that require regulation in order to protect fish and wildlife habitat. This

857 area has been mapped to generally include the following: an area 200 feet from top of bank of
 858 streams in undeveloped areas with less than 25% slope, and 100 feet from edge of mapped
 859 wetland on undeveloped land.

860 **Floodplain** means land subject to periodic flooding, including the 100-year floodplain as mapped
 861 by FEMA Flood Insurance Studies or other substantial evidence of actual flood events

862 **Functions and Values of Stream Corridors** means stream corridors have the following
 863 functions and values: water quality retention and enhancement, flood attenuation, fish and
 864 wildlife habitat, recreation, erosion control, education, aesthetic, open space and wildlife
 865 corridor.
 866

867 **Local Trip** means a trip 2½ miles or less in length.

868 **Metro** means the regional government of the metropolitan area, the elected Metro Council as
 869 the policy setting body of the government.

870 **Metro Boundary** means the jurisdictional boundary of Metro, the elected regional government
 871 of the metropolitan area.

872 **Metro Urban Growth Boundary** means the urban growth boundary as adopted and amended
 873 by the Metro Council, consistent with state law.

874 **Net Developed Acre** means

875 **Permitted Capacity** means the highest density or intensity of use of a parcel of land as
 876 calculated from zoning and other local jurisdiction regulations.

877 **Perennial Streams** means all primary and secondary perennial water ways as mapped by the U.S.
 878 Geological Survey.

879 **Prior Commitments** means

880 **Riparian area** means the water influenced area adjacent to a river, lake or stream consisting
 881 of the area of transition from an hydric ecosystem to a terrestrial ecosystem where the presence
 882 of water directly influences the soil-vegetation complex and the soil-vegetation complex
 883 directly influences the water body. It can be identified primarily by a combination of
 884 geomorphologic and ecologic characteristics.

885 **Top of Bank** means the same as "bankfull stage" defined in OAR 141-85-10(2).

886 Vacant Land: Land identified in the Metro or local government inventory as undeveloped
887 land.

888 Water Quality and Flood Management Area means an area defined on the Metro Water
889 Quality and Flood Management Area Map, attached hereto. These are areas that require
890 regulation in order to mitigate flood hazards and to preserve and enhance water quality. This
891 area has been mapped to generally include the following: stream or river channels, known and
892 mapped wetlands, areas with floodprone soils adjacent to the stream, floodplains, and
893 sensitive water areas. The sensitive areas are generally defined as 50 feet from top of bank of
894 streams for areas of less than 25 % slope, and 200 feet from top of bank on either side of the
895 stream for areas greater than 25 % slope, and 50 feet from the edge of a mapped wetland.

Table 1 - Expected Livable Share Capacity for Housing and Employment Units - Year 1994 to 2017

City or County	Dwelling Unit Capacity ¹	Job-Capacity	Mixed Use Areas ²	
			Household household	Job Increase
Beaverton	15,021	25,122	9,019	19,084
Cornelius	1,019	2,812	48	335
Durham	262	498	0	0
Fairview	2,921	5,689	635	2,745
Forest Grove	2,873	5,488	67	628
Gladstone	600	1,530	20	140
Gresham	16,817	23,753	3,146	9,695
Happy Valley	2,030	1,767	52	245
Hillsboro	14,812	58,247	9,758	20,338
Johnson City	168	180	0	0
King City	182	241	55	184
Lake Oswego	3,353	8,179	446	3,022
Maywood Park	27	5	0	0
Milwaukie	3,514	7,478	2,571	6,444
Oregon City	6,157	8,185	341	2,341
Portland	70,704	158,503	26,960	100,087
River Grove	(15)	41	0	0
Sherwood	5,010	8,156	1,108	3,585
Tigard	8,073	14,901	981	8,026
Troutdale	3,789	5,570	107	267
Tualatin	3,635	9,794	1,248	2,069
West Linn	2,577	2,114	0	594
Wilsonville	4,425	15,030	743	4,952
Wood Village	423	736	68	211
Clackamas County ³	19,530	42,685	1,661	13,886
Multnomah County ³	3,089	2,381	0	0
Washington County ³	54,999	52,578	13,273	25,450
	243,993	461,633		

Based on Housing Needs Analysis. Applies to existing city limits as of June, 1996. Annexations to cities would include assuming responsibility for livable share previously accommodated in unincorporated county.

² Target densities for mixed use area are: Central City - 250 persons per acre; regional centers - 60 ppa; town centers - 40 ppa; station communities - 45 ppa; main streets - 39 ppa.

931
932

³ Standards apply to the urban unincorporated portion of the county only. At the request of cities, Metro may also supply targets for planning areas for cities in addition to the existing boundary targets cited above.

933
934
935

Regional Parking Ratios¹ <i>(parking ratios are based on spaces per 1,000 sq ft of gross leasable area unless otherwise stated)</i>			
Land Use	Minimum Parking Requirements (See Central City Transportation Management Plan for downtown Portland stds)	Maximum Permitted Parking - Zone A:	Maximum Permitted Parking Ratios - Zone B:
	<i>Requirements may Not Exceed</i>	<i>Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas²</i>	<i>Rest of Region</i>
General Office (includes Office Park, "Flex-Space", Government Office & misc. Services) (gsf)	2.7	3.4	4.1
Light Industrial Industrial Park Manufacturing (gsf)	1.6	None	None
Warehouse (gross square feet; parking ratios apply to warehouses 150,000 gsf or greater)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Schools: College/ University & High School (spaces/#of students and staff)	0.2	0.3	0.3
Tennis Racquetball Court	1.0	1.3	1.5
Sports Club/Recreation Facilities	4.3	5.4	6.5
Retail/Commercial, including shopping centers	4.1	5.1	6.2
Bank with Drive-In	4.3	5.4	6.5

936

937
938
939

940
941
942

943
944
945

946
947
948

949

950
951

952
953

954

Regional Parking Ratios ¹ <i>(parking ratios are based on spaces per 1,000 sq ft of gross leasable area unless otherwise stated)</i>			
Land Use	Minimum Parking Requirements (See Central City Transportation Management Plan for downtown Portland stds)	Maximum Permitted Parking - Zone A:	Maximum Permitted Parking Ratios - Zone B:
	<i>Requirements may Not Exceed</i>	<i>Transit and Pedestrian Accessible Areas²</i>	<i>Rest of Region</i>
Movie Theater (spaces/number of seats)	0.3	0.4	0.5
Fast Food with Drive Thru	9.9	12.4	14.9
Other Restaurants	15.3	19.1	23
Place of Worship (spaces/seats)	0.5	0.6	0.8
Medical/Dental Clinic	3.9	4.9	5.9
Residential Uses			
Hotel/Motel	1	none	none
Single Family Detached	1	none	none
Residential unit, less than 500 square feet per unit, one bedroom	1	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, one bedroom	1.25	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, two bedroom	1.5	none	none
Multi-family, townhouse, three bedroom	1.75	none	none

¹ Ratios for uses not included in this table would be determined by local governments. In the event that a local government proposes a different measure, for example, spaces per seating area for a restaurant instead of gross leasable area, Metro may grant approval upon a demonstration by the local government that the parking space requirement is substantially similar to the regional standard.

1998 - 2001 STIP DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

APRIL/MAY 1996	Program Recommendations to OTC <i>Governor's Committees go public</i> Begin Program Update; Develop Pool of Potential Projects <i>Identify Criteria</i> <i>Start preliminary data collection for traffic modeling</i>
JUNE 1996	Distribute Final Manual and Continue Program Update
JULY 1996	Committees Report to Governor Update Revenue Projections
AUGUST 1996	Governor's Committees Report to OTC
SEPTEMBER 1996	Deadline for Submission of Project Proposals Begin Work on Traffic Analysis
NOVEMBER 1996*	Review Draft Program with OTC
DECEMBER 1996	Publish Preliminary STIP and Distribute Begin Public Involvement
JAN./FEB. 1997	Hold Formal Public Involvement Meetings
MARCH 1997*	March 12 Review Proposed Pgm. Modifications With OTC Begin CAAA Conformity Analysis (~ 4 Months) <i>As available, submit conformity to FHWA</i>
JULY 1997	Public Review of Conformity Determinations <i>30 days required</i> <i>Legislature goes home</i>
AUGUST 1997	Deadline for Local Adoption of MTIPs Finalize STIP
SEPTEMBER 1997	OTC Adopts the STIP Submit STIP for Federal Review
OCTOBER 1997	Begin Next Cycle

*METRO DECISION POINTS

WHY THE FUNDING OUTLOOK IS SO BLEAK

- ▶ The 90 percent (plus/minus) federally imposed obligation ceiling, over the past 10 years, has resulted in a growing backlog of "carryover" funds. These are dollars that have been appropriated by Congress each year but which the state/region is not allowed to obligate in the year appropriated. Historically, these "carryover" funds have been treated in the STIP as "available" funding. They "plump" any given year's newly appropriated funds. In reality though, only the sum of carryover plus new fiscal year money that equals any given year's obligation ceiling can actually be obligated. In the new STIP, ODOT is proposing to program only up to the amount that can actually be obligated in each fiscal year.
- ▶ Approximately three percent per year of FY 98 - 2001 federal revenue will be deducted per the Balanced Budget Amendment. This is reflected in the estimate of net federal revenue.
- ▶ Operations, Maintenance and Preservation is prioritized in the Statewide allocation. For instance, FY 98 -2001 O&M is up 18 percent on an annualized basis relative to FY 96-98 expenditures. Therefore, the Modernization budget is down.
- ▶ Modernization commitments have been made by ODOT in the current STIP through FY 98. Therefore, the first year of the new STIP -- i.e., FY 98 -- is already wholly committed (and does not account for prior year carryover funding commitments).
- ▶ The Regional program (i.e., Regional STP, CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement) is committed only through FY 97, but again, carryover funding commitments are not built into the regional program obligation schedule. In other words, the "first call" on FY 97 appropriations will likely be FY 96 and earlier projects slipped to FY 97. Therefore, a certain amount of FY 97 projects will be "bumped" to FY 98.
- ▶ ODOT has suggested that both the state and regional programs in Region 1 be built at a 90 percent basis -- i.e., to the expected obligation ceiling. Metro is suggesting that programming reflect 100 percent of appropriations, or in other words, that the region's program be overprogrammed in order to:
 - 1) allow for project slippage; and
 - 2) allow for "redistribution" of obligation limit on a year-by-year basis. (Each year, in August, States meeting their obligation ceiling are "redistributed" obligation authority taken from states that failed to meet their limitation. This allows an annual ceiling of 90 percent to increase by three to five percent, on average.
- ▶ As in the past, ODOT's revenue estimates reflect construction cost inflation (approximately 13 percent net between 1996 and 2001). For the first time, the Regional funding sources also reflect this anticipated inflation effect on real revenue.

ESTIMATED MODERNIZATION FUNDS FOR REGION 1 URBAN AREA: FY 98-2001

	1998	1999	2000	2001	TOTALS
Urban STP	7,664,150	7,402,200	7,140,250	6,878,300	29,084,900
Minimum Allocation	589,550	569,400	549,250	529,100	2,237,300
SUBTOTAL	8,253,700	7,971,600	7,689,500	7,407,400	31,322,200
S/N Downstate Transfer (en lieu of Funding to Tri-Met) *		(1,500,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(13,500,000) *
TOTAL REGIONAL STP	8,253,700	6,471,600	1,689,500	1,407,400	17,822,200
CMAQ	3,809,400	3,679,200	3,549,000	3,418,800	14,456,400
Enhancement	1,088,400	1,051,200	1,014,000	976,800	4,130,400
SUBTOTAL MPO FUNDS	13,151,500	11,202,000	6,252,500	5,803,000	36,409,000
Construction Inflation Factor **	0.950	0.922	0.892	0.861	
TOTAL MPO FUNDS	12,493,925	10,328,244	5,577,230	4,996,383	33,395,782
 Reg. 1 State Mod (100%)	19,722,000	19,722,000	19,722,000	19,722,000	78,888,000
80% to MPO Area	15,777,600	15,777,600	15,777,600	15,777,600	63,110,400
Construction Inflation Factor **	0.950	0.922	0.892	0.861	
TOTAL REG 1 URBAN MOD	14,988,720	14,546,947	14,073,619	13,584,514	57,193,800
TOTAL MPO FUNDS	12,493,925	10,328,244	5,577,230	4,996,383	33,395,782
 GRAND TOTAL	27,482,645	24,875,191	19,650,849	18,580,897	90,589,582

* The Bill states "In each fiscal year during the period beginning July 1, 1999, and ending June 30 ... \$6 million shall be [provided from] ... STP Flexible Funds made available to the Portland metropolitan region through state or regional transportation improvement programs [e.g. 33C or 33D fund code] for capital projects that would otherwise have been requested by or received by Tri-Met." The period July 1 to September 30, 1999 equals 1/4 of federal fiscal year 1999. On a pro rata basis, 1/4 of the \$6 million transfer would occur in FFY 99; \$6 million would be provided in FFYs that follow. In all instances, funds transferred could consist of either MPO or State formula STP funds.

** 2.5% FY 96-98; 3% FY 99; 3.25% FY 2000; 3.5% FY 2001

Source: Don Aman, ODOT Financial Services

STATE PROGRAM FY 96 -98		PROGRAMMED YEAR			FY 97 INTO FY 98+	EXTRA FUNDS NEEDED
		FY 96	FY 97	FY 98		
85	TOD REVOLVING FUND (Metro)	3.00				
154	BUS PURCHASES	5.07				
452	SPECIAL NEEDS/ALTERNATIVE SERVICE MINIBUSES	1.25				
270	METRO ADVANCE WARNING SIGNS - VAR HWYS	1.02				
272	METRO AREA FRWY DETECTION SYSTEM - VAR HWYS	0.17				
273	MOTORIST INFORMATION SYSTEM	0.60				
326	TMOC & INCIDENT RESPONSE FUNDING	1.25				
158	ALBINA RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (Portland)	0.36				
86	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD N/S COLLECTOR (Gresham)	1.84				
90	238TH AND HALSEY INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT (Mult)	0.13	0.25			
96	SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR ACCESS AT 190TH (Gresham)	0.04	0.17			
108	BARBUR BLVD BIKE LANES (ODOT)	0.08	1.36			
142	LOMBARD/BURGARD INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT	0.30	0.86			
159	HAWTHORNE BRIDGE DECK REPLACEMENT (Mult)	0.75	2.38			
177	I-5/I-84 RAMP METER INFILL-6 LOCATIONS (ODOT)	0.05	0.40			
181	FRONT ST/SB I-5 RAMP METER INFILL (ODOT)	0.08				
230	US-30B - SANDY BLVD MACS IMPLEMENTATION		3.50			
254	US-26-CAMELOT - SYLVAN (PH 1)		11.00			
922	I-84: 223RD AVENUE TO TROUTDALE	22.22				
112	N. LOMBARD RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (PE ONLY)		0.25			
150	LOVEJOY RAMP REPLACEMENT (PE ONLY)	0.60				
226	TAYLOR'S FERRY RD: NEW CONTROLLER	1.11				
	OR43: SIGNALS @ NB I-205 RAMPS		0.18			
172	99W/TUALATIN RD. INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT - PH. 1	0.46	1.34			
186	SIGNAL INTERCONNECT: MURRAY - FARMINGTON/MILIKAN		0.03			
188	BEAVERTON CENTAL TOD	0.11	0.70			
240	OR-8 TV HWY: HWY 217 TO 117TH		2.43			
934	OR10- 172ND - MURRAY (ALL STATE \$\$: PH. 2 ROW: \$7.87)		6.49			
944	I-5: WILSONVILLE INTRCHNG WIDENING (PH. 1) (ROW: \$2.75M)		5.20			
	SUBTOTAL OF PROJECTS W/ NO FY 98+ ELEMENT	40.49	36.54	0.00		
154	BUS PURCHASES (TRI-MET)			10.76		
168	SUNNYSIDE RED WIDENING: SUNYBROOK TO 122ND (FY 99)			2.00		
	OR43 @ WEST A		0.79		0.79	
	OR 43 @ McVEY		0.90		0.90	
182	GREENBURG RD/HWY 217 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT		0.36		0.36	
184	PACIFIC AVE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT (Forest Grove)		0.08		0.08	
	SUBTOTAL OF FY 98+ 2040 FUNDED COMMITMENTS	0.00	2.13	12.76	2.13	
346	EASTBANK ESPLANADE			1.62		
254	US-26-CAMELOT - SYLVAN (PH 2)		25.00		4.00	8.00
865	I-205: SUNNYBROOK INTERCHANGE			13.40		6.00 *
893	I-5/ HWY 217/KRUSE WAY INTERCHANGE			13.12		25.00
441	OR-47: COUNCIL CREEK-QUINCE (HWY 47 BYPASS)			3.70		1.40
	SUBTOTAL OF FY 98+ STATE COMMITMENTS	0.00	25.00	31.84	4.00	40.40
	SUBTOTAL OF PROJECTS W/ FY 98+ ELEMENT	0.00	27.13	44.60	6.13	40.40
	TOTAL STATE PROGRAM FY 96 - 98+	40.49	63.67	44.60	6.13	40.40
	EXPECTED SLIPPAGE FROM FY 97 TO FY 98+		-6.13		44.60	6.13
	EFFECTS OF UNPROGRAMMED COSTS					44.60
	ADJUSTED TOTAL OF OBLIGATIONS	40.49	57.54	44.60	50.73	91.13
	ANTICIPATED REGION 1 URBAN MOD FUNDS (FY 98-01)			57.19	57.19	57.19
	MOD FUNDS BALANCE			12.59	6.46	-33.94

* State/local cost allocation in dispute

REGIONAL FUND SOURCE	PROGRAMMED YEAR			FY 97 INTO FY 98+
	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	
IX & FAU/STP				
WARNER PARROTT RD - OREGON CITY BYPASS	0.40			
OTHER IX	0.99	2.57		
CITY OF PORTLAND F/STP	1.54	1.67		
MULTNOMAH COUNTY F/STP		0.10		
CLACKAMAS CO F/STP		0.82		
WASH CO F/STP	0.10			
ODOT F/STP		0.09		
METRO RESERVE F/STP		0.09		
TRI-MET F/STP		0.02		
REGIONAL STP				
864 SANDY TO GLISAN ST - 207TH/223RD CONNECTOR	3.29			
613 REGIONAL RIDESHARE/TDM PROGRAM (TRI-MET)		0.11		
142 LOMBARD/BURGARD INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT	0.10			
152 HILLSDALE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT - PHASE 1		0.46		
156 FRONT AVE RECONSTRUCTION AND BIKE LANE		1.81		
157 WOODSTOCK PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT (Portland)		0.20		
158 ALBINA RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (Portland)	0.24			
172 99W/TUALATIN RD. INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT - PH. 1		1.20		
168 SUNNYSIDE RD: SUNNYBROOK TO 122ND) ps/98 con/FY 99			3.00	
CMAQ				
609 TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT RESERVE (DEQ)	1.46			
612 SUNSET T.C. PED & BICYCLE BRIDGE (TRI-MET)		0.42		
613 REGIONAL RIDESHARE/TDM PROGRAM (TRI-MET)		0.26		
604 WILLAMETTE RV BRDGS ACCESS STUDY (MULT)	0.37	0.50		
615 PEDESTRIAN/BIKE ACCESS FOR MAX (MULT)		0.83		
619 KELLY PT PK RD BIKEWAY- RIVERGATE/LOMBARD (POP)		0.30		
620 PED/BIKE XING ON STEEL BRIDGE (PORTLAND)	0.30	0.98		
629 EASTSIDE BIKEWAY TRAIL LOOP (OMSI-SPRINGWATER)		0.58		
605 COURTNEY AVE BIKE/PEDESTRIAN LINK (CLACKAMAS)	0.14			
610 PED ENHANCE FAC/TRANSIT ACCESS STUDY (WASH)	0.17			
637 CEDAR HILLS BLVD: BOWMONT/BUTNER BIKE LN & SDWAL	0.07	0.28		
188 BEAVERTON CENTRAL TOD	0.14	0.30		
640 185th: TV HWY TO KINNAMAN BIKEWAY	0.20	0.28		
606 PED TO TRANSIT ACCESS STUDY (PORTLAND)		0.90		0.90
633 STRAWBERRY LANE BIKE LANE (CLACKAMAS)		0.21		0.21
639 HALL BLVD: SPRR/RIDGECREST BIKE LANE	0.05	0.29		0.29
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT				
275 OREGON ELECTRIC RIGHT OF WAY (WASHINGTON)		0.04		0.04
274 COLUMBIA RIVER HWY INTERPRETATIVE PANELS		0.05		
277 SOUTH TROLLEY EXTENSION PROJECT (LAKE OSWEGO)		0.20		
287 FANNO CREEK TRAIL		0.25		
302 EASTBANK TRAIL: STEEL BRIDGE TO OMSI		0.86		
311 COMPLETE CEDAR CREEK TRAIL (SHERWOOD)		0.07		
316 ROCK CREEK BIKE/PED PATHWAY (HILLSBORO)		0.21		
318 INTERMODAL TRANSFER PARK (TROUTDALE)		0.07		
321 112TH LINEAR PARK PATHWAY (WASHINGTON)		0.12		
SUBTOTAL	6.53	11.78	3.00	1.44
EXPECTED SLIPPAGE FROM FY 97 TO FY 98		-1.44		3.00
ADJUSTED TOTAL OF EXPECTED OBLIGATION	6.53	10.34	3.00	4.44
ANTICIPATED MPO FLEXIBLE FUNDS (FY 98-01)			33.40	33.40
MPO FLEXIBLE FUNDS BALANCE			30.40	28.96

REGION 2040 RESIDUAL SHORT LIST PROJECTS

CMAQ PRIORITY ALTERNATIVES
(per Metro Resolution # 93-1829A)

PROJECTS		
<hr/>		
Rank	Roadway Projects	
<hr/>		
of 48		
6	Scholls Ferry Signal Interconnect	\$31,000
10	Hwy. 43/Willamette Falls	\$115,500
11	Johnson Crk. Blvd Phase II	\$1,272,301
12	Sandy Blvd. Signal Interconnect	\$167,000
12	Powell Signal Interconnect	\$50,000
12	TV Highway Signal Interconnect	\$250,000
12	Division Sig Interconnect (60th/SE 257th)	\$186,000
17	Foster Road: 162nd to Jenne	\$600,000
30	Water Ave Extension	\$1,600,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$4,271,801
<hr/>		
Rank	Reconstruction Projects	
<hr/>		
of 6		
2	Kruse Way Reconstruct	\$1,200,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$1,200,000
<hr/>		
Rank	Freight Projects	
<hr/>		
of 6		
1	COP/Port Columbia/N. Lombard OXing (PE)	\$737,000
4	NE Columbia Blvd. Improvements	\$250,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$987,000
<hr/>		
F	TDM Projects	
<hr/>		
1	Regional TDM Program	\$718,000
5	Swan Island TMA	\$150,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$868,000
<hr/>		
Rank	Bike Projects	
<hr/>		
of 19		
1	Hawthorne Bridge Bike Lanes	\$1,560,000
3	Walker Rd Bikeway Improvement	\$296,000
4	Gateway & Hollywood bike Access	\$400,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$2,256,000
<hr/>		
Rank	Pedestrian Projects	
<hr/>		
of 24		
9	A Avenue - Lake Oswego	\$8,000
11	Cully Blvd Bike & Ped	\$1,680,000
16	Broadway/Weidler	\$2,500,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$4,188,000
<hr/>		
Rank	TOD Projects	
<hr/>		
of 7		
1	TOD Revolving Fund	\$1,500,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$1,500,000
<hr/>		
Rank	Planning	
<hr/>		
NA	Metro Planning (FY 98-2001)	\$2,000,000
	SUBTOTAL	\$2,000,000
<hr/>		
	GRAND TOTAL	\$17,270,801

Additional Service Expansion Buses (\$\$ TBD)
Additional Mini-buses (\$\$ TBD)
Ped to Transit: Phase 3 Additional funds (\$\$ TBD)
Ped to MAX Capital Program (\$\$ TBD)
Willamette Rv Br Improvements Pkg (\$\$ TBD)
Swan Is Transit Demo (\$125 K)
Johnson/McKinly Bike Ln: I-205 - Webster (\$280 K)

STATEWIDE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

(FY 02-03 construction costs for which design funds are allocated FY 98-01)

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$200,000,000
FINAL PLAN	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$200,000,000
TOTALS	\$200,000,000	\$200,000,000	\$400,000,000

REGION 1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

AT 34 PERCENT OF STATE RESOURCE

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$34,000,000	\$34,000,000	\$68,000,000
FINAL PLAN	\$34,000,000	\$34,000,000	\$68,000,000
TOTALS	\$68,000,000	\$68,000,000	\$136,000,000

MPO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

AT 80 PERCENT OF ODOT REGION 1 RESOURCE

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$27,200,000	\$27,200,000	\$54,400,000
FINAL PLAN	\$27,200,000	\$27,200,000	\$54,400,000
TOTALS	\$54,400,000	\$54,400,000	\$108,800,000

Scheduled Final Plan Funding During FY 98 - 2001

PROJECT	CONSTR EST.	FINAL PLAN TARGET DATE			
		98	99	00	01
I-5/Wilsonville Interchange (Unit 2)	5.784			X	
I-5/217/Kruse Way Unit 2	11.234		X		
U.S. 26: Murray Blvd - 217	10.693			X	
U.S. 26: Hwy 217 - Camelot EB	7.342		X		
U.S. 26: Camelot - Sylvan (Ph 3)	20.224		X		
Farmington Rd: 209th - 172nd	11.481		X		
Hwy 217 NB: Sunset to TV Hwy	23.654				X
Hwy 217 NB Off Ramp at Scholls	0.281	X			
Subtotal	90.693				
FY 02-03 CONSTRUCTION COST BUDGET	54.4				
FINAL PLAN OVERPROGRAM	36.293				

Scheduled EIS/Recon Funding During FY 98 -2001

PROJECT	CONSTR EST.	EIS/RECON TARGET DATE			
		98	99	00	01
<i>EIS Milestone</i>					
I-5: E. Marq. Intch-Grand/MLK Blvd Ramps	56.026			X	
I-5: Greeley Ramp-N. Banfield Intch	125.137			X	
Hwy 217: TV Hwy-72nd Ave Intch	45.877		X		
I-205 @ Clakamas Hwy (Sunrise)	65.180	X			
U.S. 26 (Sunrise Corridor): I-205-Rock Cr. Jct.	<u>80.741</u>	X			
Subtotal	372.961				
<i>Recon Milestone</i>					
Mt. Hood Parkway	<u>129.776</u>	?			
Subtotal	502.737				
FY 02-03 CONSTRUCTION COST BUDGET	<u>54.400</u>				
EIS/RECON OVERPROGRAM	448.337				



METRO

1996-2001 MTIP/STIP DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE Metro/ODOT Region 1

Milestones

AUGUST 1996	45-Day Public Notification of Update Start; Finalize Revenue Forecasts
SEPTEMBER 1996	Begin Update; <i>Public Informational Kick-Off (September 19, tentative)</i>
SEPTEMBER/ OCTOBER 1996	Approval of Draft State Modernization Program for Public Comment; Approval of Selection Criteria for Flexible Funding Allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>TPAC</i> <i>September 27</i>- <i>JPACT</i> <i>October 10</i>- <i>Metro Council</i> <i>October 17</i>
NOVEMBER 1996	Deadline for Jurisdictions/Agencies to Submit Projects (November 15)
DECEMBER 1996	Complete Technical Ranking of Projects
JANUARY 1997	<i>Public Workshops (Priorities '97)</i>
FEBRUARY/ MARCH 1997	Adoption of Final State Modernization Program and Flexible Funding Allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>TPAC</i> <i>February 28</i>- <i>JPACT</i> <i>March 13</i>- <i>Metro Council</i> <i>March 20</i>
APRIL-JUNE 1997	Conduct Air Quality Conformity Analysis
JULY 1997	<i>Public Review of Conformity (30 day)</i>
AUGUST 1997	JPACT/Metro Council Adoption of Final MTIP/STIP, Including Conformity
SEPTEMBER	OTC Adopts Joint MTIP/STIP

Note: Action items require public hearings and result in adoption actions by JPACT and the Metro Council. *Other public involvement activities are shown in italics.*

WHY THE FUNDING OUTLOOK IS SO BLEAK

- ▶ Estimates of gross federal revenue in FY 98-2001 are assumed to be flat or slightly lower than appropriated during ISTEA. Also, approximately three percent per year -- compounded -- of projected FY 98-2001 federal revenue will be deducted from each year's appropriation, per the Balanced Budget Amendment. This is reflected in the estimate of net federal revenue. On the state side, net gas tax receipts will continue to decline due both to inflation and to increasing fuel efficiency of the state's vehicle fleet.
- ▶ A 90 percent (plus/minus) federally imposed obligation ceiling, over the past 10 years, has resulted in a growing backlog of "carryover" funds. These are dollars that have been appropriated by Congress each year but which the state/region is not allowed to obligate in the year appropriated. Historically, these "carryover" funds have been treated in the STIP as "available" funding. In reality though, only the sum of carryover plus new fiscal year money that equals any given year's obligation ceiling can actually be obligated. In the new STIP, ODOT is proposing to program only up to the amount that can actually be obligated in each fiscal year.
- ▶ Operations, Maintenance and Preservation is prioritized in the Statewide allocation. For instance, FY 98-2001 O&M is up 18 percent on an annualized basis relative to FY 96-98 expenditures. Therefore, the Modernization budget is down.
- ▶ Modernization commitments have been made by ODOT in the current STIP through FY 98. Therefore, the first year of the new STIP -- i.e., FY 98 -- is already wholly committed (and does not account for prior year carryover funding commitments).
- ▶ The Regional program (i.e., Regional STP, CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement) is committed only through FY 97, but again, carryover funding commitments are not built into the regional program obligation schedule. In other words, the general priority for FY 97 appropriations will likely be FY 96 and earlier projects that have slipped to FY 97. Therefore, a certain amount of FY 97 projects will move to FY 98.
- ▶ ODOT has suggested that both the state and regional programs in Region 1 be built at a 90 percent basis -- i.e., to the expected obligation ceiling. Metro is suggesting that programming reflect 100 percent of appropriations, or in other words, that the Region's program be overprogrammed in order to:
 - 1) allow for project slippage; and
 - 2) allow for "redistribution" of obligation limit on a year-by-year basis. (Each year, in August, States meeting their obligation ceiling are "redistributed" obligation authority taken from states that failed to meet their limitation. This allows an annual ceiling of 90 percent to increase by three to five percent, on average.)
- ▶ As in the past, ODOT's revenue estimates reflect construction cost inflation (approximately 13 percent -- net -- between 1996 and 2001). For the first time, the Regional funding sources also reflect this anticipated inflation effect on real revenue.

ESTIMATED MODERNIZATION FUNDS FOR REGION 1 URBAN AREA: FY 98-2001

	1998	1999	2000	2001	TOTALS
Urban STP	7,664,150	7,402,200	7,140,250	6,878,300	29,084,900
Minimum Allocation	589,550	569,400	549,250	529,100	2,237,300
SUBTOTAL	8,253,700	7,971,600	7,689,500	7,407,400	31,322,200
S/N Downstate Transfer (en lieu of Funding to Tri-Met) *		(1,500,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(13,500,000) *
TOTAL REGIONAL STP	8,253,700	6,471,600	1,689,500	1,407,400	17,822,200
CMAQ	3,809,400	3,679,200	3,549,000	3,418,800	14,456,400
Enhancement	1,088,400	1,051,200	1,014,000	976,800	4,130,400
SUBTOTAL MPO FUNDS	13,151,500	11,202,000	6,252,500	5,803,000	36,409,000
Construction Inflation Factor **	0.950	0.922	0.892	0.861	
TOTAL MPO FUNDS	12,493,925	10,328,244	5,577,230	4,996,383	33,395,782
Reg. 1 State Mod (100%)	19,722,000	19,722,000	19,722,000	19,722,000	78,888,000
80% to MPO Area	15,777,600	15,777,600	15,777,600	15,777,600	63,110,400
Construction Inflation Factor **	0.950	0.922	0.892	0.861	
TOTAL REG 1 URBAN MOD	14,988,720	14,546,947	14,073,619	13,584,514	57,193,800
TOTAL MPO FUNDS	12,493,925	10,328,244	5,577,230	4,996,383	33,395,782
GRAND TOTAL	27,482,645	24,875,191	19,650,849	18,580,897	90,589,582

* The Bill states "In each fiscal year during the period beginning July 1, 1999, and ending June 30 ... \$6 million shall be [provided from] ... STP Flexible Funds made available to the Portland metropolitan region through state or regional transportation improvement programs [e.g. 33C or 33D fund code] for capital projects that would otherwise have been requested by or received by Tri-Met." The period July 1 to September 30, 1999 equals 1/4 of federal fiscal year 1999. On a pro rata basis, 1/4 of the \$6 million transfer would occur in FFY 99; \$6 million would be provided in FFYs that follow. In all instances, funds transferred could consist of either MPO or State formula STP funds.

** 2.5% FY 96-98; 3% FY 99; 3.25% FY 2000; 3.5% FY 2001

Source: Don Aman, ODOT Financial Services

STATE PROGRAM FY 96 -98		PROGRAMMED YEAR			FY 97 INTO FY 98+	EXTRA FUNDS NEEDED
		FY 96	FY 97	FY 98		
85	TOD REVOLVING FUND (Metro)	3.00				
154	BUS PURCHASES	5.07				
452	SPECIAL NEEDS/ALTERNATIVE SERVICE MINIBUSES	1.25				
270	METRO ADVANCE WARNING SIGNS - VAR HWYS	1.02				
272	METRO AREA FRWY DETECTION SYSTEM - VAR HWYS	0.17				
273	MOTORIST INFORMATION SYSTEM	0.60				
326	TMOC & INCIDENT RESPONSE FUNDING	1.25				
158	ALBINA RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (Portland)	0.36				
86	CIVIC NEIGHBORHOOD N/S COLLECTOR (Gresham)	1.84				
90	238TH AND HALSEY INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT (Mult)	0.13	0.25			
96	SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR ACCESS AT 190TH (Gresham)	0.04	0.17			
108	BARBUR BLVD BIKE LANES (ODOT)	0.08	1.36			
142	LOMBARD/BURGARD INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT	0.30	0.86			
159	HAWTHORNE BRIDGE DECK REPLACEMENT (Mult)	0.75	2.38			
177	I-5/I-84 RAMP METER INFILL-6 LOCATIONS (ODOT)	0.05	0.40			
181	FRONT ST/SB I-5 RAMP METER INFILL (ODOT)	0.08				
230	US-30B - SANDY BLVD MACS IMPLEMENTATION		3.50			
254	US-26-CAMELOT - SYLVAN (PH 1)		8.50			
922	I-84: 223RD AVENUE TO TROUTDALE	22.22				
112	N. LOMBARD RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (PE ONLY)		0.25			
150	LOVEJOY RAMP REPLACEMENT (PE ONLY)	0.60				
226	TAYLOR'S FERRY RD: NEW CONTROLLER	1.11				
	OR43: SIGNALS @ NB I-205 RAMP		0.18			
172	99W/TUALATIN RD. INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT - PH. 1	0.46	1.34			
186	SIGNAL INTERCONNECT: MURRAY - FARMINGTON/MILIKAN		0.03			
188	BEAVERTON CENTAL TOD	0.11	0.70			
240	OR-8 TV HWY: HWY 217 TO 117TH		2.43			
934	OR10- 172ND - MURRAY (ALL STATE \$\$: PH. 2 ROW: \$7.87)		6.49			
944	I-5: WILSONVILLE INTRCHNG WIDENING (PH. 1) (ROW: \$2.75M)		5.20			
	SUBTOTAL OF PROJECTS W/ NO FY 98+ ELEMENT	40.49	34.04	0.00		
154	BUS PURCHASES (TRI-MET)			10.76		
168	SUNNYSIDE RD WIDENING: SUNYBROOK TO 122ND (FY 99)			2.00		
	OR43 @ WEST A		0.79		0.79	
	OR 43 @ McVEY		0.90		0.90	
182	GREENBURG RD/HWY 217 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT		0.36		0.36	
184	PACIFIC AVE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT (Forest Grove)		0.08		0.08	
	SUBTOTAL OF FY 98+ 2040 FUNDED COMMITMENTS	0.00	2.13	12.76	2.13	
346	EASTBANK ESPLANADE			1.62		
254	US-26-CAMELOT - SYLVAN (PH 2)		28.00		4.00	8.00
865	I-205: SUNNYBROOK INTERCHANGE			13.40		6.00 *
893	I-5/ HWY 217/KRUSE WAY INTERCHANGE			13.12		23.00
441	OR-47: COUNCIL CREEK-QUINCE (HWY 47 BYPASS)			3.70		1.40 **
	SUBTOTAL OF FY 98+ STATE COMMITMENTS	0.00	28.00	31.84	4.00	38.40
	SUBTOTAL OF PROJECTS W/ FY 98+ ELEMENT	0.00	30.13	44.60	6.13	38.40
	TOTAL STATE PROGRAM FY 96 - 98+	40.49	64.17	44.60	6.13	38.40
	EXPECTED SLIPPAGE FROM FY 97 TO FY 98+		-6.13		44.60	6.13
	EFFECTS OF UNPROGRAMMED COSTS					44.60
	ADJUSTED TOTAL OF OBLIGATIONS	40.49	58.04	44.60	50.73	89.13
	ANTICIPATED REGION 1 URBAN MOD FUNDS (FY 98-01)			57.19	57.19	57.19
	MOD FUNDS BALANCE		12.59		6.46	-31.94

* State/local cost allocation in dispute

** ODOT's 50 percent cost share

REGIONAL FUND SOURCE	PROGRAMMED YEAR			FY 97 INTO FY 98+
	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	
IX & FAU/STP				
WARNER PARROTT RD - OREGON CITY BYPASS	0.40			
OTHER IX	0.99	2.57		
CITY OF PORTLAND F/STP	1.54	1.67		
MULTNOMAH COUNTY F/STP		0.10		
CLACKAMAS CO F/STP		0.82		
WASH CO F/STP	0.10			
ODOT F/STP		0.09		
METRO RESERVE F/STP		0.09		
TRI-MET F/STP		0.02		
REGIONAL STP				
864 SANDY TO GLISAN ST - 207TH/223RD CONNECTOR	3.29			
613 REGIONAL RIDESHARE/TDM PROGRAM (TRI-MET)		0.11		
142 LOMBARD/BURGARD INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT	0.10			
152 HILLSDALE PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT - PHASE 1		0.46		
156 FRONT AVE RECONSTRUCTION AND BIKE LANE		1.81		
157 WOODSTOCK PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT (Portland)		0.20		
158 ALBINA RAILROAD OVERCROSSING (Portland)	0.24			
172 99W/TUALATIN RD. INTERSECTION REALIGNMENT - PH. 1		1.20		
168 SUNNYSIDE RD: SUNNYBROOK TO 122ND) pe/98 con/FY 99			3.00	
CMAQ				
609 TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT RESERVE (DEQ)	1.46			
612 SUNSET T.C. PED & BICYCLE BRIDGE (TRI-MET)		0.42		
613 REGIONAL RIDESHARE/TDM PROGRAM (TRI-MET)		0.26		
604 WILLAMETTE RV BRDGS ACCESS STUDY (MULT)	0.37	0.50		
615 PEDESTRIAN/BIKE ACCESS FOR MAX (MULT)		0.83		
619 KELLY PT PK RD BIKEWAY- RIVERGATE/LOMBARD (POP)		0.30		
620 PED/BIKE XING ON STEEL BRIDGE (PORTLAND)	0.30	0.98		
629 EASTSIDE BIKEWAY TRAIL LOOP (OMSI-SPRINGWATER)		0.58		
605 COURTNEY AVE BIKE/PEDESTRIAN LINK (CLACKAMAS)	0.14			
610 PED ENHANCE FAC/TRANSIT ACCESS STUDY (WASH)	0.17			
637 CEDAR HILLS BLVD: BOWMONT/BUTNER BIKE LN & SDWAL	0.07	0.28		
188 BEAVERTON CENTRAL TOD	0.14	0.30		
640 185th: TV HWY TO KINNAMAN BIKEWAY	0.20	0.28		
606 PED TO TRANSIT ACCESS STUDY (PORTLAND)		0.90		0.90
633 STRAWBERRY LANE BIKE LANE (CLACKAMAS)		0.21		0.21
639 HALL BLVD: SPRR/RIDGECREST BIKE LANE	0.05	0.29		0.29
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT				
275 OREGON ELECTRIC RIGHT OF WAY (WASHINGTON)		0.04		0.04
274 COLUMBIA RIVER HWY INTERPRETATIVE PANELS		0.05		
277 SOUTH TROLLEY EXTENSION PROJECT (LAKE OSWEGO)		0.20		
287 FANNO CREEK TRAIL		0.25		
302 EASTBANK TRAIL: STEEL BRIDGE TO OMSI		0.86		
311 COMPLETE CEDAR CREEK TRAIL (SHERWOOD)		0.07		
316 ROCK CREEK BIKE/PED PATHWAY (HILLSBORO)		0.21		
318 INTERMODAL TRANSFER PARK (TROUTDALE)		0.07		
321 112TH LINEAR PARK PATHWAY (WASHINGTON)		0.12		
SUBTOTAL	6.53	11.78	3.00	1.44
EXPECTED SLIPPAGE FROM FY 97 TO FY 98		-1.44		3.00
ADJUSTED TOTAL OF EXPECTED OBLIGATION	6.53	10.34	3.00	4.44
ANTICIPATED MPO FLEXIBLE FUNDS (FY 98-01)			33.40	33.40
MPO FLEXIBLE FUNDS BALANCE			30.40	28.96

STATEWIDE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

(FY 02-03 construction costs for which design funds are allocated FY 98-01)

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$200,000,000
FINAL PLAN	\$100,000,000	\$100,000,000	\$200,000,000
TOTALS	\$200,000,000	\$200,000,000	\$400,000,000

REGION 1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

AT 34 PERCENT OF STATE RESOURCE

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$34,000,000	\$34,000,000	\$68,000,000
FINAL PLAN	\$34,000,000	\$34,000,000	\$68,000,000
TOTALS	\$68,000,000	\$68,000,000	\$136,000,000

MPO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM BUDGETS

AT 80 PERCENT OF ODOT REGION 1 RESOURCE

	2002	2003	TOTALS
EIS PHASE	\$27,200,000	\$27,200,000	\$54,400,000
FINAL PLAN	\$27,200,000	\$27,200,000	\$54,400,000
TOTALS	\$54,400,000	\$54,400,000	\$108,800,000

Scheduled Final Plan Funding During FY 98 - 2001

PROJECT	CONSTR EST.	FINAL PLAN TARGET DATE			
		98	99	00	01
I-5/Wilsonville Interchange (Unit 2)	5.784			X	
I-5/217/Kruse Way Unit 2	11.234		X		
U.S. 26: Murray Blvd - 217	10.693			X	
U.S. 26: Hwy 217 - Camelot EB	7.342		X		
U.S. 26: Camelot - Sylvan (Ph 3)	20.224		X		
Farmington Rd: 209th - 172nd	11.481		X		
Hwy 217 NB: Sunset to TV Hwy	23.654				X
Hwy 217 NB Off Ramp at Scholls	0.281	X			
Subtotal	90.693				
FY 02-03 CONSTRUCTION COST BUDGET	<u>54.4</u>				
FINAL PLAN OVERPROGRAM	36.293				

Scheduled EIS Funding During FY 98 - 2001

PROJECT	CONSTR EST.	EIS/RECON TARGET DATE			
		98	99	00	01
<i>EIS Milestone</i>					
I-5: E. Marq. Intch-Grand/MLK Blvd Ramps	56.026			X	
I-5: Greeley Ramp-N. Banfield Intch	125.137			X	
Hwy 217: TV Hwy-72nd Ave Intch	45.877		X		
Mt. Hood Parkway	129.776		X		
I-205 @ Clakamas Hwy (Sunrise)	65.180	X			
U.S. 26 (Sunrise Corridor): I-205-Rock Cr. Jct.	<u>80.741</u>	X			
Subtotal	502.737				
FY 02-03 CONSTRUCTION COST BUDGET	<u>54.400</u>				
EIS OVERPROGRAM	448.337				

Scheduled Reconnaissance Activity in FY 98 STIP

PROJECT	CONSTR EST.
Tualatin-Sherwood Expressway	150.000

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT - 8/8/96

DATE _____

NAME

AFFILIATION

Roy Rogers

WASHINGTON City

Les White

C-TRAN

Dean Lookingbill

RTC

Claudette LaVert

City of
Mult county

David Lohman

Port of Portland

Gary Lomnick

City of Clackamas Co

Gerry Smith

WSDOT

GREG GREEN

NEQ

Red Monroe

Metro Council

Andy Whyn

Metro

CHARLIE HALL

City of Portland

Kate Deane

City of Portland

GB ARROWOOD

TRI-MET

STEVE DOTTERER

CITY OF PORTLAND

Grant Carter

Wash Co

Tom Vanderanden

Clackamas Co.

DOO SANTOR

CLACKAMAS COUNTY

John Ried

Clackamas Co.

RICHARD ROSS

CITIES OF MULT CO.

Leo Huff

ODOT

DAVE MURPHY

ODOT

Russ LaSene

Pat

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE _____

DATE _____

NAME

AFFILIATION

Kathy Leblond

Washington County

John Rosenberg

Washington County

O.K.D. NORRIS

Valley Times Newspaper

Rob Drake