

MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AND THE JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

November 15, 1995

Council Chamber

Committee Members Present: Chair Gussie McRobert, Dick Benner, Phil Bogue, Bud Farm, Charlie Hales, Darlene Hooley (alternate for Judie Hammerstad), Jon Kvistad, Peggy Lynch, Susan McLain, Jeannine Murrell, Chuck Petersen, Dan Saltzman, Jean Schreiber, Jim Zehren

JPACT Members Present: Chair/Metro Councilor Rod Monroe, Earl Blumenauer, John Godsey, Patricia McCaig,

Alternates Present: Royal Harshman (alternate for Gussie McRobert), Jill Thorn (alternate for Jean Schreiber), Don Morissette (alternate for the three Metro Council members Kvistad, McLain and Washington), Lou Ogden (alternate for Jeannine Murrell)

Staff Present: Charlie Ciecko, Andy Cotugno, John Fregonese, Jane Hart, Carol Kelsey, Carol Krigger, Pat Lee, Larry Shaw, Stuart Todd, Mark Turpel, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk

Also Present: Nicholas Anderson, Hayhurst Neighborhood Association (HNA); Patrice Anderson, HNA; Linda Bauer, PVNA; Meeky Blizzard, Portland; Doug Bollam, citizen; Bob Bothman, Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement; Bill Brandon, Happy Valley; Renee Cannon; Tom Coffee, Lake Oswego; Jeff Davis, Gresham; Elsa Coleman, Portland; Maggie Collins, Milwaukie; Elana Emlen, Portland; Paul Glenn, citizen; Mike Houck, Audubon Society/Coalition for a Livable Future; Leo Huff, ODOT; Jim Jacks, Tualatin; John Jackson, Unified Sewerage Agency; Barbara Kanz, Oregon Title & COMPA; John Kowalczyk, DEQ; Carol Landsman, David Evans & Associates; Bob LeFeber, Maybourne Real Estate; Rob Look, Operating Engineers; Mike Mabrey, Gresham, Maureen Murphy, citizen; Carol Neuberger, Citizens for Better Highways; Nashi Ota, Portland; Ed Pickering, Multnomah County; Carolyn Rundorff, HNA; Ken Sandblast, citizen; Nat Senley, Citizens for Better Highways; Doug Strickler, citizen/PSU student; Cindy Sturm, Norris Beggs & Simpson; Susan Turner, DEQ; Karen Upton, HNA; Ric Vrana, Portland State University CVS; Corinne Weber, HNA; Kate Wenne, Portland; Will Werner, David Evans & Associates; Lavinia Wihtol, Portland

Chair McRobert called the special meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

There were no introductions

2. INTERIM MEASURES

- 2.1 *Growth Management Recommendations*
- 2.2 *Transportation Recommendations*
- 2.3 *Water Resource Recommendations*
- 2.4 *Greenspaces Recommendations*
- 2.5 *State Recommendations*

Chair McRobert said the purpose of the meeting was to discuss Interim Measures jointly with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation. Chair McRobert explained and reviewed the Interim Measures to-date (all documents referred to filed with the meeting record): Measure 1, Change zoning maps to implement the Metro Growth Concept; Measure 2, Change zoning text to provide for mixed uses and compact urban designs in station areas, regional and town centers, main streets and corridors; Measure 3, Parking; Measure 4, Protect, restore and enhance natural resources and water quality; Measure 5, Manage retail in employment areas; and Measure 6, Implement the rural reserve and green corridors. Following the six overarching regional measures were 51 possible local measures (Nos. 7-58).

The Committee briefly discussed the origin of the hand-outs before them.

Andy Cotugno, Director of Transportation Planning, explained Resolution No. 95-2235, For the Purpose of Adopting Region 2040 Early Implementation Measures for Transportation. He listed and explained the following transportation actions in support of the Region 2040 Growth Concept pending and/or underway:

1. Accelerate adoption of the revised policy framework for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to address:
 - new standards for defining congestion;
 - new roadway design guidelines, particularly in high density, mixed use areas to ensure designs are compatible with intended land uses;
 - encouragement of new "skinny street" standards, better street connectivity and few cul-de-sac streets in residential areas;
 - establishment of modal targets for each Region 2040 land use type to achieve the VMT (vehicle miles travelled) per capita reduction requirement and serve as the basis for implementing modal improvements into and within these areas; and
2. Accelerate implementation by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) of the Employee Commute Options (ECO) Program;
3. Define methods to protect needed roadway capacity for trucks;
4. Ensure the propose project list for the Regional Arterial Program is supportive of the Region 2040 Growth Concept;
5. Request Tri-Met to define key transit capital and service improvements targeted at high density, mixed used areas to be the basis for their ballot measure to be considered in 1996;

6. Work with MPAC, JPACT and DEQ to reduce required parking ratios and establish voluntary ,maximum parking rations as early implementation measures but to defer definition of maximum parking ratios to the Regional Framework Plan at a later date. These actions will help reduce VMT per capita and parking spaces per capita (as required by the Transportation Planning Rule), help reduce land consumption and increase densities and help the region meet and maintain federal air quality standards; and
7. Continue pursuing actions to encourage and provide incentives for transit-oriented development.

The Committee discussed Resolution No. 95-2235. Peggy Lynch said the resolution differed from the factual background and analysis for the Growth Concept and expressed concern about timelines that might not match. She said if interpretations of HB 2709 differed, there should be different timelines for implementation and asked if Tri-Met was properly up to speed with regard to 2040 implementation. Jim Zehren said the functional plan would be adopted in Spring 1996, so the resolution was consistent with the timeline so far. He said the Regional Framework Plan was much more crucial and asked if transportation and land use planning would match for the latter. Andy Cotugno said the transportation component was being accelerated to match the 2040 Growth Concept and said the process for the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) had begun work on the Administrative Rule also. Regarding Jim Zehren's question on trucks, Andy Cotugno said he could not answer that. He said there was a difference with regard to parking maximums. He said MPAC wanted to move forward on those via the Interim Measures and JPACT felt they should be implemented during the Regional Framework Plan.

Councilor Morissette said JPACT voted to approve reducing parking minimums. He said MPAC had voted to approve parking maximums. He said the 2040 Means Business Committee had talked to commercial users of parking and had difficulty with implementing maximums unless there had been lengthy discussion on same. Chair McRobert said MPAC had held lengthy discussions on parking, that establishing and implementing parking measures implemented part of the 1992 Metro Charter mandate, and said she was not clear on how the 2040 Means Business Committee fit into this process. Councilor Morissette said it was important that the private sector understand and support what Metro was doing for its programs to be successful. Chair McRobert cited parking programs in other cities such as San Francisco, Palo Alto and Seattle that were mandated and unpopular at first but were now considered successful. Councilor Morissette said Metro had made great efforts to communicate that 2040 was important, but did not know if parking measures could be as successful. Commissioner Hales said parking maximums were not new and that many large cities used them. He said 80 percent was not a hardship and cited Portland's program giving builders grants and loans to create alternative structures to decrease parking needs. He said unless all three factors were used; maximums, minimums and incentives, were used; parking measures would not be successful. He said with incentives, industry would adapt.

Councilor McLain concurred with Commissioner Hales, but said it was known that there were exception areas that should be accounted for. She said the 2040 Means Business Committee's business would be done by March 1996. She said a parking subcommittee had been formed and a retailer served on it. She said the Interim Measures during implementation would give Metro the practical experience with which to form a better Framework Plan. Councilor Morissette again expressed concern and stated that using both parking minimums and maximums was not feasible for the business community. He said the Portland program mentioned by Commissioner Hales seemed feasible. Commissioner Hales said this issue and discussion was the reason JPACT and MPAC should meet more often. Commissioner Blumenauer said if the groundwork for this type of thing was done now, implementation would be easier three years from now. Councilor Schreiber said problems understanding the issues might have resulted because different parking studies had been done and that information had not been shared equally by all parties. She said JPACT should see what MPAC had seen and MPAC should see what JPACT had seen. Chair McRobert said John Fregonese's Park-O-Matic electronic spreadsheet had been very helpful in understanding the issues.

Commissioner Saltzman said he did not know where the 2040 Means Business Committee fit into the process either and said there should be an opportunity or process for them to give their input at some point.

John Godsey said the region was not homogenous and imposing one overall parking maximum for the whole region would not work. He said parking maximums should not be artificially imposed on parking standards where people could not get to facilities by transit other than auto. He said Metro should talk to the business community that built the facilities people wanted to use. Chair McRobert said staff was evaluating exception areas. Councilor Schreiber said 125 percent parking maximums were based on both data and long discussions.

Councilor Monroe said JPACT had not spent very much time on interim measures including parking. He said JPACT would discuss the issues at their next meeting. He concurred with Commissioner Blumenauer's statement that what would cause the business community to "flee" was uncertainty and said parking issues should be evaluated further. He thanked MPAC for their work on the issues.

Mayor Ogden said he did not care for parking measures, but said it was good to get going on the issues and find out what the problems and the good aspects were and what solutions could be developed. He said the parking subcommittee could work on the issues further and said the commitment could be that parking regulations not be as stringent if adequate relief for affected businesses was not found.

John Reeves said MPAC had held extensive conversations and suggested providing JPACT with the minutes on same. Chair McRobert concurred and said they should also be provided with the results of both JPACT's and MPAC's analysis on parking. She said regional centers would fail without parking maximums.

Discussion on parking issues concluded, the Committee discussed Agenda Item No. 4, Greenspaces Recommendations.

John Jackson, Unified Sewerage Agency and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) member, addressed the Overarching Measures, particularly Measure 4 and said water service providers' biggest concern was about maintaining communication(s) on infrastructure management; that they were willing to accommodate growth, but felt that doing so would take innovation and thoughtfulness during the 2040 process; and he concurred with John Godsey's comment that the region was not homogenous and that it was important to acknowledge the flexibility of regional water sources and resources. He said the language offered at this meeting was new and he did not know where it came from.

The Committee discussed the revised language submitted by Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department staff which was different from the language printed in their agenda packets. The Committee asked that revised language in the future be clearly identified and attributed to the author. Councilor McLain said the pink hand-out in the original agenda contained the language changes that WRPAC had told MPAC in advance was coming. She said the new hand-out at the table (white) contained language that Greenspaces staff had thought about and felt was important to include even though it was late in the process. She said the new language was refinement of current language and was acceptable to her.

Chair McRobert asked John Jackson what he thought about the new language. He said he had not had a chance to review the new language.

Chair McRobert asked the Committee if they wanted to review the new language or simply forward it to the full Council for review. Commissioner Hales said it was best at this time to forward the language MPAC had. He said they could review the new language. Councilor McLain encouraged John Jackson to come to the November 16 Councilor meeting or later Council meetings and give his input. Mike Houck said WRPAC and Metro staff could work on language before it went to Council also. Peggy Lynch said like the RUGGOs, the Interim Measures were going forward and said she appreciated having the new information even though MPAC would not comment on it at this time.

Charlie Ciecko, Director, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department, apologized for the new language being late. He said staff would improve their coordination on that type of thing in the future.

Dick Benner said he had assurance from state agencies following this process that they collectively wanted to do what they could for a successful 2040 process. He explained LCDC's grants program and said local jurisdictions should have already received information on same. He said most of the activities locals would do to implement the Interim Measures would likely be eligible for state funding assistance. He said transportation grant funds were available again this biennium. He complimented Metro and the local governments for their hard work on the Interim Measures. He said they were essential to the State's work dealing with growth.

Dick Benner noted LCDC continually got inquiries about what Metro was doing. He said the parking measures and other Interim Measures were in existence in response to the State's Transportation Planning Rule adopted in 1991. He said it covered parking requirements aimed at Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and said those measures were essential to contain urban growth and also to deal with the requirements of HB 2709.

Chair McRobert asked what the will of the Committee was. Councilor Monroe said a quorum of JPACT was not present and therefore JPACT could not take action at this time anyway. Jim Zehren asked if the Council would adopt what both MPAC and JPACT had done. He said he was not sure how compatible the joint Interim Measures would be. Chair McRobert said staff would analyze what both groups had done and submit that to the Council for their consideration. John Fregonese said the Council would now get recommendations from the advisory committees and input from other parties including 2040 Means Business. He said the Council would give staff direction via resolution and then the recommendations/language had to be turned into legal language for the Functional Plan which would be adopted via ordinance in Spring 1996.

Councilor Monroe gave the public hearings schedule for the Community Bridge and Road Program; 1) Beaverton, December 4; 2) Hillsboro, December 6; 3) Lake Oswego, December 7; 4) Milwaukie, December 11; 5) Portland, December 13; and 6) Gresham, December 14. He said Metro was asking for \$200 million over six years via a 4 percent regional gas tax. He said the program would rehabilitate bridges over the Willamette River, make roads safer and reduce congestion by increasing capacity, maintain critical arteries for commerce, make connections for public transit, construct pedestrian improvements and bike lanes, and provide access to key commerce centers. He said there had been extensive discussion with Governor Kitzhaber on how to have a successful program and what the size of the bond ought to be.

Andy Cotugno distributed a chart of projects and explained same. He said the proposed improvements did not include light rail projects.

Commissioner Saltzman asked if a funding mechanism had been determined. Councilor Monroe said there were a variety of proposals, but said based on preliminary discussion to-date, there would likely be a mix of gas taxes.

Andy Cotugno briefly reviewed other multi-modal projects that would be funded under the Community Bridge and Road Program.

Corrinne Weber, Hayhurst Neighborhood Association, testified about a neighborhood community center about to be built in the Hayhurst area and said it was an inappropriate facility for that neighborhood based on the transit connections available and especially considering the proposed size of the facility.

Chair McRobert explained that Ms. Weber should present her concerns to the City of Portland as it was not a Metro-related issue and MPAC could not assist her on that issue.

All business items completed, Chair McRobert adjourned the special meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Meeting record prepared by Paulette Allen, Program Assistant I

i:\gm\paulette\mpac\mpac1115.min

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 10-12-95

NAME	AFFILIATION
EARL BLUMENAUER	PORTLAND
DON MORISSETTE	METRO
Langdon Marshall	DEQ
AGHew	Metro
Red Monroe	Metro Council
Mike Burton	Metro Exec
BRELLWAUER	ODOT
TOM WALSH	T/M
Roy Rogers	WASH. County
ROB DRAKE	CITIES OF WASH. CO.
Edwin	Clackamas County
Greg J. Tomush	City of Clackamas Co
Dean Kinghill	RTC
Gerry Smith	WSDOT
Nary Fetsch	TM
Laurie Garrett	TM
Patricia Mc	Metro
GB ARRINGTON	TRI-MET
David Kaden	Tri-Met
Mary heagy	WSDOT
Lidwien Rahman	ODOT
Tim Collins	Metro
REBECCA OCKEN	CITY OF GRESHAM

REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM
PROJECT SCHEDULE (Rev. 10/9/95)

Page 1

MAY 1996 ELECTION

<u>Timing</u>	<u>Task</u>
July 21, 1995	Notice to Proceed
July 28	Brief TPAC
July/Early/August	Finalize Work Plan and Schedule Preliminary Research Establish Program Goals and Objectives, Project Criteria Establish Standards for Project Information Financial Analysis Begins: Initial Revenue Options Initial Stakeholder Contacts Design Public Attitude Survey
August	Public Attitude Surveys
August 14	Brief JPACT Finance Committee
August 17	Brief JPACT; Authorize Project Solicitation
August 18	Solicit Projects
August/September	Work with Local Jurisdictions to Develop Project Submittals
Late August	Report on Results of Public Attitude Survey Report on Results of Stakeholder Interviews
September	Select Election Date
September 1	TPAC Update
September 7	JPACT Finance Committee
September 14	JPACT Update
September 18	Deadline for Project Submittals
September/October	Evaluate Projects Engineering/Cost Standardization Financial Plan Completed
September 29	TPAC Update
October 10	JPACT Finance Committee Update

REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM
PROJECT SCHEDULE (Rev. 10/9/95)

Page 2

October 12	JPACT Update
October/November	Focus Groups Stakeholder Contacts
November/December	Public Involvement
November 17	Staff Recommendations on Projects/Tax Package
December 1	TPAC Review of Projects
December 4-15	Public Meetings to Review Projects
December 14	JPACT Review of Projects
December 21	Metro Council Review of Projects/Public Input
January 5	TPAC Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 9	Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 11	Metro Council Hearing
January 18	JPACT Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 25	Metro Council Refers Ballot Measure
January-April	Ballot Measure Campaign
May 14, 1996	Election Day

Group	Meeting Participants	Contact/Set-up Person	Done
Gresham Downtown Business Assn. West Gresham Businesses Gresham Chamber (key people from each) (11/6 2:30)	Gussie McRobert Tanya Collier Richard Ross Ruth McFarland	Rebecca Ocken	
Gresham Transportation System CAC	Richard Ross Ruth McFarland	Rebecca Ocken	
AAA Roger Graybeal (x6903)	Don Morissette Mike Burton Earl Blumenauer Rod Monroe (Andy Cotugno)	Gary Conkling	
North Clackamas Chamber Econ. Dev'l Council (11/6 11:45 am)	Ed Lindquist Craig Lomnicki Andy Cotugno Don Morissette	Nancy Waddell	
Milwaukie Downtown Development Assn. (Board mtg 12/13 7:30 am)	Craig Lomnicki Andy Cotugno	Nancy Waddell	
Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Felicia Trader John Rosenburger Rod Sandoz (Andy Cotugno)	Kate Deane	
North Macadam Business Assn.	Vic Rhodes Andy Cotugno Rod Sandoz	Kate Deane	
Hillsboro Chamber (Trans. Comm - 11/2 7 am)	Jerry Parmenter Elsa Coleman Andy Cotugno Susan McLain	Anne Madden	
Shippers (10/27 kick-off phoning 225 shippers)	Jerry Parmenter Susie Lahsene	Jane DeMarce Susie Lashene	
Forest Grove Chamber (Gov't Services Comm. - 11/7) (Board in December)	Susan McLain Jerry Parmenter Andy Cotugno	Anne Madden	
South Washington County Managers Meeting	?		
Tigard Chamber	Jerry Parmenter Jon Kvistad Jim Nicolai	Anne Madden	
Tualatin Chamber	Jerry Parmenter Don Morissette Jon Kvistad	Anne Madden	
Beaverton Chamber (Trans Comm. - 10/11) (Board - 10/17)	Andy Cotugno Jerry Parmenter	Anne Madden	X
I-5/217 Steering Comm. (10/10)	Andy Cotugno		X

**Community Road and Bridge Fund
Draft 10/25/95**

**Public officials to receive oral
comments at meeting**

Beaverton

(Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Roy Rogers
Rob Drake
Jon Kvistad
Susan McLain
Earl Blumenauer
Bruce Warner
Tom Walsh

Lake Oswego

(Thursday, December 14, 5:30 – 8:30
p.m.)

Alice Schlenker
Don Morissette
Ed Linquist
Heather Chrisman
Bob Post
Bruce Warner

Hillsboro

(Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Linda Peters
Roy Rogers
Susan McLain
Jon Kvistad
Bob Post
Mike Thorne

Gresham

(Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Tanya Collier
Rod Monroe
Ruth McFarland
Gussie McRobert
Claudette LaVert
Mike Thorne

Milwaukie

(Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Craig Lomnicki
Ed Linquist
Don Morissette
Patricia McCaig
Bruce Warner
Dave Lohman

Portland

(Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Earl Blumenaur
Patricia McCaig
Ed Washington
Tanya Collier
Tom Walsh
Rod Monroe
Mike Thorne

DRAFT (to be mailed 11/8/95)

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARING

A series of six open houses in December and a public hearing in January are scheduled to provide an opportunity for public review and comment on transportation projects being considered by Metro for inclusion in a regional community road and bridge program. The program would finance a package of transportation projects from through out the metropolitan region to improve roads and bridges. Metro is considering asking for voter approval of a 4 cent gas tax and a 4 cent diesel tax to fund the program.

The projects under consideration were submitted to Metro by area county and city governments and include projects to repair Willamette River Bridges, improve safety and capacity on key roads, maintain road arteries for commerce, construct bike lanes and pedestrian improvements, implement the 2040 growth concept and provide public transit enhancements.

The meeting dates, times and locations are as follows:

- Beaverton:** **Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Beaverton City Hall, 4755 SW Griffith Drive
Tri-Met bus lines 54 and 59
- Hillsboro:** **Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Washington County Public Service Building, 155 N. First Ave.
Tri-Met bus line 57
- Milwaukie:** **Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Milwaukie Center, 5440 SE Kellogg Creek Drive
Tri-Met bus line 29
- Portland:** **Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
Tri-Met bus line 6, or take MAX to the Oregon Convention Center
- Lake Oswego:** **Thursday, December 14, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.**
(drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
City Hall, 380 A Avenue
Tri-Met bus lines 35, 78, 36 and 37
- Gresham:** **Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Gresham City Hall, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway
Tri-Met bus lines 4 and 23 or take MAX to Gresham City Hall

Meeting format

Staff from throughout the region will be available during the duration of each open house to answer questions and provide information. The public is encouraged to drop in at any time during the open houses. An oral comment period will begin at 6 p.m.

Opportunities for comments

The open houses will include an opportunity to make oral comments to a panel of Metro councilors and local elected and appointed officials beginning at 6 p.m. Oral comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person. Oral comments may also be called in to Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. Written comments will be accepted at the open houses and can be mailed to: Metro Transportation Department, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232 or faxed to (503) 797-1794. **All comments must be received by Wednesday, January 3, 1996 at 5 p.m.** Comments will be forwarded to the Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.

Final schedule

- **Public Hearing – 7 p.m., January 11, 1996. Metro Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland**
The hearing will provide an opportunity for formal testimony to the Metro Council.
- **Final Council Action – January 25, 1996**
The Metro Council will consider referring the Community Road and Bridge Fund to the ballot for voter approval.

For more information

To request a list or map of the transportation projects under consideration call Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. For more information or to request a speaker contact:

- Clackamas County: Rod Sandoz, (503) 650-3272
- Gresham: Rebecca Ocken, (503) 669-2816
- Metro: Pamela Peck, (503) 797-1866
- Multnomah County: Susan Lee, (503) 248-4295
- Port of Portland: Jane DeMarco, (503) 731-7055
- Portland: Mary Volm, (503) 823-7785
- Washington County: Anne Madden, (503) 693-4963

M E E T I N G N O T I C E

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1797



METRO

DRAFT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARING

A series of six open houses in December and a public hearing in January are scheduled to provide an opportunity for public review and comment on transportation projects being considered by Metro for inclusion in a regional Community Bridge and Road Program. The program would finance a package of transportation projects from throughout the metropolitan region to improve bridges and roads. Metro is considering asking for voter approval of a 4-cent gas tax and a 4-cent diesel tax to fund the program.

The Community Bridge and Road Program is being developed through a cooperative planning effort of Metro and local governments including the City of Portland, Washington, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. The projects under consideration include projects to repair Willamette River Bridges, improve safety and capacity on key roads, maintain road arteries for commerce, construct bike lanes and pedestrian improvements, implement the 2040 growth concept and provide public transit enhancements.

The meeting dates, times and locations are as follows:

- Beaverton:** **Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Beaverton City Hall, 4755 SW Griffith Drive
Tri-Met bus lines 54 and 59
- Hillsboro:** **Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Washington County Public Service Building, 155 N. First Ave.
Tri-Met bus line 57
- Lake Oswego:** **Thursday, December 7, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.**
(drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
City Hall, 380 A Avenue
Tri-Met bus lines 35, 78, 36 and 37
- Milwaukie:** **Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Milwaukie Center, 5440 SE Kellogg Creek Drive
Tri-Met bus line 29
- Portland:** **Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
Tri-Met bus line 6, or take MAX to the Oregon Convention Center

– more –

Gresham: **Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)**
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Gresham City Hall, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway
Tri-Met bus lines 4 and 23 or take MAX to Gresham City Hall

Meeting format

Staff from throughout the region will be available during the duration of each open house to answer questions and provide information. The public is encouraged to drop in at any time during the open houses. An oral comment period will begin at 6 p.m.

Opportunities for comments

The open houses will include an opportunity to make oral comments to a panel of Metro councilors and local elected and appointed officials beginning at 6 p.m. Oral comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person. Oral comments may also be called in to Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. Written comments will be accepted at the open houses and can be mailed to: Metro Transportation Department, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232 or faxed to (503) 797-1794. **All comments must be received by Wednesday, January 3, 1996 at 5 p.m.** Comments will be forwarded to the Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.

Final schedule

- **Public Hearing – __ p.m., January 11, 1996. Metro Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland**
The hearing will provide an opportunity for formal testimony to the Metro Council.
- **Final Council Action – January 25, 1996**
The Metro Council will consider referring the Community Bridge and Road Program to the ballot for voter approval.

For more information

To request a list or map of the transportation projects under consideration call Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. For more information or to request a speaker contact:

- Clackamas County: Rod Sandoz, (503) 650-3272
- Gresham: Rebecca Ocken, (503) 669-2816
- Metro: Pamela Peck, (503) 797-1866
- Multnomah County: Susan Lee, (503) 248-4295
- Port of Portland: Jane DeMarco, (503) 731-7055
- Portland: Mary Volm, (503) 823-7785
- Washington County: Anne Madden, (503) 693-4963

**Community Bridge and Road
Program**

**Public officials to receive oral
comments at meeting**

Beaverton

(Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Roy Rogers
Rob Drake
Jon Kvistad
Susan McLain
Earl Blumenauer
Bruce Warner
Tom Walsh

Portland

(Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Earl Blumenauer
Patricia McCaig
Ed Washington
Tanya Collier
Tom Walsh
Rod Monroe
Mike Thorne

Hillsboro

(Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Linda Peters
Roy Rogers
Susan McLain
Jon Kvistad
Bob Post
Mike Thorne

Gresham

(Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Tanya Collier
Rod Monroe
Ruth McFarland
Gussie McRobert
Claudette LaVert
Mike Thorne

Lake Oswego

(Thursday, December 7, 5:30 – 8:30
p.m.)

Alice Schlenker
Don Morissette
Ed Linnquist
Heather Chrisman
Bob Post
Bruce Warner

Milwaukie

(Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m.)

Craig Lomnicki
Ed Linnquist
Don Morissette
Patricia McCaig
Bruce Warner
Dave Lohman

**REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM
PROJECT SCHEDULE (Rev. 10/9/95)**

Page 1

MAY 1996 ELECTION

<u>Timing</u>	<u>Task</u>
July 21, 1995	Notice to Proceed
July 28	Brief TPAC
July/Early/August	Finalize Work Plan and Schedule Preliminary Research Establish Program Goals and Objectives, Project Criteria Establish Standards for Project Information Financial Analysis Begins: Initial Revenue Options Initial Stakeholder Contacts Design Public Attitude Survey
August	Public Attitude Surveys
August 14	Brief JPACT Finance Committee
August 17	Brief JPACT; Authorize Project Solicitation
August 18	Solicit Projects
August/September	Work with Local Jurisdictions to Develop Project Submittals
Late August	Report on Results of Public Attitude Survey Report on Results of Stakeholder Interviews
September	Select Election Date
September 1	TPAC Update
September 7	JPACT Finance Committee
September 14	JPACT Update
September 18	Deadline for Project Submittals
September/October	Evaluate Projects Engineering/Cost Standardization Financial Plan Completed
September 29	TPAC Update
October 10	JPACT Finance Committee Update

**REGIONAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM
PROJECT SCHEDULE (Rev. 10/9/95)**

Page 2

October 12	JPACT Update
October/November	Focus Groups Stakeholder Contacts
November/December	Public Involvement
November 17	Staff Recommendations on Projects/Tax Package
December 1	TPAC Review of Projects
December 4-15	Public Meetings to Review Projects
December 14	JPACT Review of Projects
December 21	Metro Council Review of Projects/Public Input
January 5	TPAC Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 9	Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 11	Metro Council Hearing
January 18	JPACT Reviews Program/Ballot Measure
January 25	Metro Council Refers Ballot Measure
January-April	Ballot Measure Campaign
May 14, 1996	Election Day

Group	Meeting Participants	Contact/Set-up Person	Done
Gresham Downtown Business Assn. West Gresham Businesses Gresham Chamber (key people from each) (11/6 2:30)	Gussie McRobert Tanya Collier Richard Ross Ruth McFarland	Rebecca Ocken	
Gresham Transportation System CAC	Richard Ross Ruth McFarland	Rebecca Ocken	
AAA Roger Graybeal (x6903)	Don Morissette Mike Burton Earl Blumenauer Rod Monroe (Andy Cotugno)	Gary Conkling	
North Clackamas Chamber Econ. Dev'l Council (11/6 11:45 am)	Ed Lindquist Craig Lomnicki Andy Cotugno Don Morissette	Nancy Waddell	
Milwaukie Downtown Development Assn. (Board mtg 12/13 7:30 am)	Craig Lomnicki Andy Cotugno	Nancy Waddell	
Bicycle Transportation Alliance	Felicia Trader John Rosenburger Rod Sandoz (Andy Cotugno)	Kate Deane	
North Macadam Business Assn.	Vic Rhodes Andy Cotugno Rod Sandoz	Kate Deane	
Hillsboro Chamber (Trans. Comm - 11/2 7 am)	Jerry Parmenter Elsa Coleman Andy Cotugno Susan McLain	Anne Madden	
Shippers (10/27 kick-off phoning 225 shippers)	Jerry Parmenter Susie Lahsene	Jane DeMarce Susie Lashene	
Forest Grove Chamber (Gov't Services Comm. - 11/7) (Board in December)	Susan McLain Jerry Parmenter Andy Cotugno	Anne Madden	
South Washington County Managers Meeting	?		
Tigard Chamber	Jerry Parmenter Jon Kvistad Jim Nicolai	Anne Madden	
Tualatin Chamber	Jerry Parmenter Don Morissette Jon Kvistad	Anne Madden	
Beaverton Chamber (Trans Comm. - 10/11) (Board - 10/17)	Andy Cotugno Jerry Parmenter	Anne Madden	X
I-5/217 Steering Comm. (10/10)	Andy Cotugno		X

**Community Road and Bridge Fund
Draft 10/25/95**

**Public officials to receive oral
comments at meeting**

**Beaverton
(Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m.)**

Roy Rogers
Rob Drake
Jon Kvistad
Susan McLain
Earl Blumenauer
Bruce Warner
Tom Walsh

**Hillsboro
(Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m.)**

Linda Peters
Roy Rogers
Susan McLain
Jon Kvistad
Bob Post
Mike Thorne

**Milwaukie
(Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m.)**

Craig Lomnicki
Ed Linquist
Don Morissette
Patricia McCaig
Bruce Warner
Dave Lohman

**Portland
(Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m.)**

Earl Blumenauer
Patricia McCaig
Ed Washington
Tanya Collier
Tom Walsh
Rod Monroe
Mike Thorne

**Lake Oswego
(Thursday, December 14, 5:30 – 8:30
p.m.)**

Alice Schlenker
Don Morissette
Ed Linquist
Heather Chrisman
Bob Post
Bruce Warner

**Gresham
(Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m.)**

Tanya Collier
Rod Monroe
Ruth McFarland
Gussie McRobert
Claudette LaVert
Mike Thorne

DRAFT (to be mailed 11/8/95)

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARING

A series of six open houses in December and a public hearing in January are scheduled to provide an opportunity for public review and comment on transportation projects being considered by Metro for inclusion in a regional community road and bridge program. The program would finance a package of transportation projects from throughout the metropolitan region to improve roads and bridges. Metro is considering asking for voter approval of a 4 cent gas tax and a 4 cent diesel tax to fund the program.

The projects under consideration were submitted to Metro by area county and city governments and include projects to repair Willamette River Bridges, improve safety and capacity on key roads, maintain road arteries for commerce, construct bike lanes and pedestrian improvements, implement the 2040 growth concept and provide public transit enhancements.

The meeting dates, times and locations are as follows:

- Beaverton:** Monday, December 4, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Beaverton City Hall, 4755 SW Griffith Drive
Tri-Met bus lines 54 and 59
- Hillsboro:** Wednesday, December 6, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Washington County Public Service Building, 155 N. First Ave.
Tri-Met bus line 57
- Milwaukie:** Monday, December 11, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Milwaukie Center, 5440 SE Kellogg Creek Drive
Tri-Met bus line 29
- Portland:** Wednesday, December 13, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue
Tri-Met bus line 6, or take MAX to the Oregon Convention Center
- Lake Oswego:** Thursday, December 14, 5:30 – 8:30 p.m.
(drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
City Hall, 380 A Avenue
Tri-Met bus lines 35, 78, 36 and 37
- Gresham:** Thursday, December 14, 5 – 8 p.m. (drop in any time)
oral comment period begins at 6 p.m.
Gresham City Hall, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway
Tri-Met bus lines 4 and 23 or take MAX to Gresham City Hall

Meeting format

Staff from throughout the region will be available during the duration of each open house to answer questions and provide information. The public is encouraged to drop in at any time during the open houses. An oral comment period will begin at 6 p.m.

Opportunities for comments

The open houses will include an opportunity to make oral comments to a panel of Metro councilors and local elected and appointed officials beginning at 6 p.m. Oral comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person. Oral comments may also be called in to Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. Written comments will be accepted at the open houses and can be mailed to: Metro Transportation Department, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR 97232 or faxed to (503) 797-1794. **All comments must be received by Wednesday, January 3, 1996 at 5 p.m.** Comments will be forwarded to the Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council.

Final schedule

- **Public Hearing – 7 p.m., January 11, 1996. Metro Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland**
The hearing will provide an opportunity for formal testimony to the Metro Council.
- **Final Council Action – January 25, 1996**
The Metro Council will consider referring the Community Road and Bridge Fund to the ballot for voter approval.

For more information

To request a list or map of the transportation projects under consideration call Metro's transportation hotline, (503) 797-1900. For more information or to request a speaker contact:

- Clackamas County: Rod Sandoz, (503) 650-3272
- Gresham: Rebecca Ocken, (503) 669-2816
- Metro: Pamela Peck, (503) 797-1866
- Multnomah County: Susan Lee, (503) 248-4295
- Port of Portland: Jane DeMarco, (503) 731-7055
- Portland: Mary Volm, (503) 823-7785
- Washington County: Anne Madden, (503) 693-4963

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2231 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT TRI-MET'S JOINT COMPLEMENTARY PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE FOR 1996 CONFORMS TO METRO'S REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: October 17, 1995

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution certifies to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) that Tri-Met's Joint Complementary Paratransit Plan Update for 1996 conforms to Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Tri-Met is required to obtain this certification from Metro to meet the requirements of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990.

TPAC has reviewed Tri-Met's update on the Paratransit Plan and recommends approval of Resolution No. 95-2231.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1990, mandates the development of a plan to address discrimination and equal opportunity for disabled persons in employment, transportation, public accommodation, public services, and telecommunications. The original ADA transportation plan, as developed by Tri-Met and adopted by the Tri-Met Board of Directors on December 18, 1991, outlined the requirements of the Act as applied to Tri-Met's service area, the deficiencies of the existing service when compared to the requirements of the new Act, and the remedial measures necessary to bring Tri-Met and the region into compliance with the Act.

The final rule also requires that Metro, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, review Tri-Met's Paratransit Plan annually and certify that the plan conforms to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This certification is one of the required components of Tri-Met's submittal to the Federal Transit Administration and, without the certification, Tri-Met cannot be found to be in compliance with the ADA.

Annual Plan Update Requirements

It is required under 49 CFR part 37.139(h) that the Paratransit Plan be updated and certified each year. The annual plan update must include all significant changes and revisions to the established timetable for implementation and address how and when key milestones within the plan are being met (49 CFR part 37.139(j)). It is also required that milestone slippage greater than one year be addressed.

The 1995 Paratransit Plan Update, previously submitted by Tri-Met and certified by Metro in Resolution No. 95-1995, included several milestones that were to be achieved by January 1996. The status of these milestones are addressed in Tri-Met's 1996 Annual Paratransit Plan Update.

Tri-Met's 1996 Annual Plan Update

Tri-Met's 1996 Annual Paratransit Plan Update identifies current activities and planned strategies for complying with the milestones previously committed to in their 1995 Plan update (see item B below). It is required that the 1996 Paratransit Plan Update be approved and submitted to FTA by January 26, 1996. A schedule of review and approval dates is included as Attachment A.

A. Progress On Milestones To Be Achieved Prior to 1/25/96

Tri-Met achieved full compliance with ADA for the following milestones identified in the 1995 Plan Update (Table 1 in the 1996 Paratransit Plan Update which is included as Exhibit A to the resolution). This Complementary Paratransit Plan update (January 1996) complies with the requirements of 49 CFR Section 37.139.

1. Trips scheduled within one hour of requested pickup time.
2. No substantial numbers of significantly untimely pickups for initial or return trips.
3. No substantial number of trip denials or missed trips.
4. No substantial number of trips with excessive trip lengths.

B. Revised ADA Paratransit Plan Timetable for 1996

Tri-Met had indicated in their 1995 plan update that requests for rides on a "next day basis" would be achieved by April 1995. This date has been revised to August 1996. The slippage occurred as a result of delays in procurement and installation of a new bus dispatch system for both fixed-route and paratransit service, installation of new automated paratransit scheduling software and a new menu-driven phone system. The bus dispatch system is scheduled for installation in June 1996. While adjusting to the new system, Tri-Met will begin moving to next-day ride reservations by August 1996 with full compliance expected by January 1997.

C. Plan Review by Citizens for Accessible Transportation (CAT) Committee

A public hearing and comment period was held by the Citizens for Accessible Transportation on October 18, 1995 on the

proposed 1996 update. A summary of the testimony and comments will be provided at the October 27 TPAC meeting.

D. Plan Review by Tri-Met Board of Directors

The Tri-Met Board will be reviewing the plan for approval at their normal meeting on November 22, or November 29, 1995.

With the implementation of next-day service, Tri-Met's proposed Paratransit Plan Update will conform to the Interim Federal RTP. Chapter 1 of the RTP specifies that Tri-Met will offer services which address ADA by continuing to:

- develop complementary paratransit services which comply with the ADA;
- specify lifts on all new high-floor transit vehicles or ramps on low-floor transit vehicles;
- work with local jurisdictions to make transit stops accessible; and
- develop other facilities and services which are accessible to customers with disabilities as required by the ADA.

The Phase II updated RTP (May 1996) will also be consistent with the ADA service requirements.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 95-2231.

ATTACHMENT A

TIMETABLE FOR 1996 PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Date</u>
Distribution of Plan and Notice of Public Hearing	10-2-95
Initial Review by CAT.	10-18-95
Review by TPAC	10-27-95
Review by JPACT.	11-9-95
Second Review by CAT	11-15-95
Review by Tri-Met Board.	11-22 or 11-29-95
Metro Transportation Planning Committee.	12-5-95
Metro Council Adoption	12-14-95
Due at FTA	1-26-96

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT)	RESOLUTION NO. 95-2231
TRI-MET'S JOINT COMPLEMENTARY)	
PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE FOR 1996)	Introduced by
CONFORMS TO METRO'S REGIONAL)	Councilor Rod Monroe, Chair
TRANSPORTATION PLAN)	JPACT

WHEREAS, The U.S. Department of Transportation issued a final rule implementing the transportation provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) on September 6, 1991; and

WHEREAS, The final rule as applied to the Portland metropolitan area requires Tri-Met to develop an annual Paratransit Plan Update which conforms to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

WHEREAS, The final rule requires that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) review the Paratransit Plan Update and certify that it conforms to the RTP; and

WHEREAS, The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation certifies that it has reviewed the ADA Paratransit Plan Update for 1996 prepared by Tri-Met as required under 49 CFR part 37.139(h) and finds it to be in conformance with the RTP (the transportation plan developed under 49 CFR part 613 and 23 CFR part 450); and

WHEREAS, The Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation recommends certification by the Metro Council; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Metro Council hereby certifies that it has reviewed the ADA Paratransit Plan prepared by Tri-Met (included as Exhibit

A) as required under 49 CFR part 37.139(h) and finds it to be in conformance with the RTP, the transportation plan developed under 49 CFR part 613 and 23 CFR part 450 (the UMTA/FHWA joint planning regulation), for a period of one year.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____,
1995.

J. Ruth McFarland, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

EXHIBIT A

DRAFT

1996 ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)
Paratransit Plan Update
of the
Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon
(Tri-Met)

DRAFT

January 26, 1996

PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE FOR 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Identification of Submitting Entity and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Certification	1
	Identification of Submitting Entities	2
	Form 1: MPO Certification	3
II.	Timetables, Progress Report on Milestones, and Six (6) Service Criteria Compliance	4
	Table 1: 1994-1996 Milestone Timetable And Milestone Progress Report On 1995 Accomplishments	5
	Form 2: Significant Milestone Slippage Explanation	6
	Table 2: Revised Timetable (1995-1996)	7
	Table 3: Eligibility, 6 Service Criteria, and Full Compliance Date	8
III.	Demand And Service Estimates	10
	Table 4: Demand And Service Estimates	11
IV.	Budget, Cost and Vehicle Estimates	13
	Table 5: ADA Paratransit Costs	14
	Table 6: Total System Costs	15
	Table 7: Accessible Fixed Route Buses	16
	Table 8: Paratransit Vehicles Used On The System	17
	Table 9: ADA Paratransit Customers	18
V.	Public Participation	19

	Description of Public Participation	20
VI.	Unresolved Issues	28
	Letter from FTA with No Unresolved Issues	29
VII.	Other Issues	30
	Description of Other Issues	31
VIII.	Attachments	32

1996 PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

SECTION I

IDENTIFICATION OF SUBMITTING ENTITIES

AND

MPO CERTIFICATION

IDENTIFICATION OF SUBMITTING ENTITIES

Tri-Met
4012 SE 17th Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97202
(503) 238-4915

Authorized Person: Tom Walsh, General Manager
(503) 238-4915

Contact Person: Gary Boley, Manager
Demand Responsive Programs
(503) 238-5809, TTY (503) 238-5811

Metropolitan Service District (Metro)
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-1797
(503) 797-1700

Authorized Person: _____, Presiding Officer
(503) 797-1700

Contact Person: Rich Ledbetter, Senior Transportation Planner
(503) 797-1761

1996 PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

SECTION II

TIMETABLES, PROGRESS REPORT ON MILESTONES

AND

SIX SERVICE CRITERIA

1994-1996 ADA PARATRANSIT PLAN TIMETABLE AND PROGRESS REPORT * (Table 1)

1994 UPDATE MILE- TARGET STONE DATE MET ? (MM/YY) (Y/N)	1995 NEW DATE ? (MM/YY)
1995 MILESTONE PROGRESS REPORT - as of Jan. 1996 (Y/N - period January 26, 1995 - January 25, 1996)	
09/94	Full Compliance with ADA including
N	a. Request accepted on "next day" basis
Y	b. Trips scheduled within one hour of requested pickup time
Y	c. No substantial numbers of significantly untimely pickups for initial or return trips
Y	d. No substantial number of trip denials or missed trips
Y	e. No substantial number of trips with excessive trip lengths
	8 -96
	N/A
	N/A
	N/A
	N/A

Note: Using Form 2, provide detailed written explanation on milestone slippage greater than one full year (12 months).

* List all 1994-1996 ADA Paratransit Milestones; Then Indicate Progress (Y/N) On Milestones Targeted To Be Achieved Prior To 1/26/95; Include Additional Accomplishments

FORM 2

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

JAN. 96

EXCEPTION REPORT: MILESTONE SLIPPAGE EXPLANATION*

	Target Date	New Target Date
<u>MILESTONE or FULL COMPLIANCE DELAYS:</u>	<u>'95 Update</u>	<u>'96 Update</u>
1. Next day ride reservations	4/95	8/96

Slippage occurred as a result of delays in procurement and installation of a new bus dispatch system for both fixed-route and paratransit service, installation of new automated paratransit scheduling software and a new menu driven phone system. The bus dispatch system is scheduled for installation in June '96. While adjusting to the new system we will begin moving to next day ride reservations by 8/96 with full compliance in 1/97.

***Note:** A narrative explanation, using Form 2, must accompany Table 1, when there is significant milestone slippage. During the 1994-1996 period, "significant milestone slippage" exists (1) when the target date for Plan full compliance is delayed or (2) when individual milestones slip by a year (a full 12 months). This Form 2 provides a brief example of such a slippage explanation. If there are no milestone or full compliance delays, no explanation is required, and Form 2 can be omitted. [Attach as many additional sheets to this form as needed; you may put this form on your own wordprocessor.]

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

REVISED 1995 - 1996 ADA PARATRANSIT PLAN TIMETABLE (Table 2)

1995 - 1996

TARGET DATE
(MM/YY)

ANY REMAINING MILESTONES -- JANUARY 1995 UPDATE

08/96

Extend reservation hours to mon, the day before service

01/97

Full compliance

ELIGIBILITY, SIX SERVICE CRITERIA, AND FULL COMPLIANCE DATE (Table 3, Page 1)

COMPLIANCE ITEM	IN FULL COMPLIANCE NOW (Y/N)	IF NO, EXPECTED DATE OF FULL COMPLIANCE (MM/YY)
ELIGIBILITY PROCESS		
1. Requests for certification being accepted and all aspects of policy (appeals, documentation, etc.) established	Y	
2. Compliance with companion and personal care attendant requirements	Y	
3. Compliance with visitor requirements	Y	
SIX SERVICE CRITERIA		
SERVICE AREA		
4. Service to all origins and destinations within the defined area	Y	
5. Coordination with contiguous/overlapping service areas, if applicable	Y	
RESPONSE TIME		
6. Requests accepted during normal business hours on "next day" basis	N	8 - 96
7. Requests accepted on all days prior to days of service (e.g., weekends/holidays)	Y	
8. Requests accepted at least 14 days in advance	Y	
9. Trips scheduled within one hour of requested pickup time	Y	
FARES		
10. No more than twice the base fixed route fare for eligible individuals	Y	
11. Compliance with companion fare requirement	Y	

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

(Table 3, Page 2)

IN FULL COMPLIANCE NOW (Y/N)	IF NO, EXPECTED DATE OF FULL COMPLIANCE (MM/YY)
------------------------------	---

COMPLIANCE ITEM

12. Compliance with personal care attendant fare requirement

Y

DAYS AND HOURS OF SERVICE

13. Paratransit provided during all days and hours when fixed route service is in operation

Y

TRIP PURPOSES

14. No restriction on types of trip purposes

Y

15. No prioritization by trip purpose in scheduling

Y

CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS

16. No restrictions on the number of trips an individual will be provided

Y

17. No waiting lists for access to the service

Y

18. No substantial numbers of significantly untimely pickups for initial or return trips

Y

19. No substantial numbers of trip denials or missed trips

Y

20. No substantial numbers of trips with excessive trip lengths

Y

21. When capacity is unavailable, subscription trips are less than 50 percent

Y

DATE TARGETED FOR "FULL COMPLIANCE" WITH ALL "ADA PARATRANSIT" REQUIREMENTS

In 1994 Update Submission

9/94

In 1996 Update Submission

1/96

1996 PARATRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

SECTION IV

BUDGET, COST AND VEHICLE ESTIMATES

ADA PARATRANSIT DEMAND AND SERVICE ESTIMATES (Table 4, Page 1)

	Actual 1992	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Est. 1995	Proj. 1996	Proj. 1997
DEMAND (No. Trips/Year) (Thousands of One-Way Trips)						
1. ADA Paratransit Trips Provided/Year (000)	446	487	541	585	644	695
2. Total Paratransit Trips Provided/Year (000) (Total ADA and non-ADA)	510	556	619	670	738	797
3. Total Paratransit Revenue Hours/Year (000) (Total ADA and non-ADA) [Sec. 15 definition]	239	258	268	275	303	327

In 1991, total paratransit trips (line 2) were: 504

ADA PARATRANSIT SERVICE: Purchased Transportation

- 4. For 19⁹⁶ estimate the number of trips on line 1 that were provided by contracted taxi service: 25,000
- 5. For 19⁹⁶ estimate the number of trips on line 1 that our system purchased (contracted out) rather than provide in-house: 541,000
(include contracted taxi service from line 4 and other service owned or operated by the contractors)

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

ADA PARATRANSIT SERVICE (Table 4, Page 2)

	Actual 1994	Proj. 1997	
6. SSA Clients. In 1995, estimate the number of trips on line 1, that you provided to clients of local social service agencies (SSA), who prior to the ADA, provided SSA paratransit service for their clients. Provide an estimate for 1997. (Optional)	192,000	248,000	
7. Trip Denials. In 1995, estimate the number of requested ADA paratransit trips that were "denied" because of capacity limitations. (Please do not include trips missed because of traffic or vehicle breakdowns, trips negotiated outside the 1 hour window, "no-shows," etc.) How many by 1997? (Required)	900	500	
8. Destinations. Clearly, it is discrimination under the ADA to prioritize trip requests based on trip purpose. However, for 199 , please estimate the percent of <u>trips</u> on line 1 that were for the following purposes: (Optional)			
Work Trips	39 %	Food/Shopping	19 %
Dialysis	6 %	Medical Trips (Other Than Dialysis)	12 %
Educational	1 %	Other Trips	23 %

Note: Percentages above should total 100%.

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

ADA PARATRANSIT CAPITAL & OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY (Table 5)

(projections in thousands of 1995 dollars)

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Proj.	Proj.	6 Year
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Total
							92-97
ADA PARATRANSIT EXPENSES *							
1. Capital Expenses	<u>1,544</u>	<u>1,425</u>	<u>2,078</u>	<u>1,511</u>	<u>2,214</u>	<u>385</u>	<u>9,156</u>
2. Operating Expenses	<u>5,235</u>	<u>5,949</u>	<u>6,516</u>	<u>7,667</u>	<u>8,417</u>	<u>8,984</u>	<u>42,768</u>
3. Subtotal ADA Paratransit Expenses (sum of lines 1 + 2)	<u><u>6,779</u></u>	<u><u>7,374</u></u>	<u><u>8,593</u></u>	<u><u>9,178</u></u>	<u><u>10,630</u></u>	<u><u>9,369</u></u>	<u><u>51,924</u></u>
TOTAL PARATRANSIT EXPENSES ** (ADA & Non-ADA combined)							
4. Capital Expenses	<u>1,625</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>2,187</u>	<u>1,591</u>	<u>2,330</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>9,638</u>
5. Operating Expenses	<u>5,655</u>	<u>6,446</u>	<u>6,992</u>	<u>8,228</u>	<u>9,020</u>	<u>9,617</u>	<u>45,958</u>
6. TOTAL PARATRANSIT EXPENSES (sum of lines 4 and 5)	<u><u>7,280</u></u>	<u><u>7,946</u></u>	<u><u>9,119</u></u>	<u><u>9,819</u></u>	<u><u>11,350</u></u>	<u><u>10,022</u></u>	<u><u>55,596 **</u></u>

IN 1991, TOTAL PARATRANSIT COSTS (Line 6) FOR OUR TRANSIT SYSTEM WERE \$ 5,972

* Using a ratio to break out ADA from total paratransit expenses is acceptable. Do not include any ADA fixed-route costs.

** If non-ADA paratransit service is provided, add ADA to non-ADA costs to obtain Total Paratransit Expenses.

Excludes OMAP & AIS costs. (AIS costs are included under system costs, but not under paratransit)

**Dollar amounts have been reduced to exclude a cost neutral Intergovernmental Medicaid contract to broker rides with the State of Oregon's Department of Human Resources. Tri-Met incurs no cost and does not include rides as they were already being provided by other transportation providers prior to the brokerage agreement.

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

TOTAL TRANSIT SYSTEM COST ESTIMATES (Table 6)
 (projections in thousands of 1995 dollars)

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Est.	Proj.	Proj.	6 Year
TOTAL TRANSIT SYSTEM COSTS *	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Total
	-----						92-97
1. Capital Expenses	<u>18,414</u>	<u>23,499</u>	<u>27,544</u>	<u>44,404</u>	<u>68,242</u>	<u>14,533</u>	<u>196,636</u>
2. Operating Expenses	<u>105,087</u>	<u>115,474</u>	<u>125,692</u>	<u>139,981</u>	<u>145,090</u>	<u>148,597</u>	<u>779,901</u>
3. TOTAL SYSTEM COSTS (lines 1 + 2)	<u>123,501</u>	<u>138,993</u>	<u>153,236</u>	<u>184,385</u>	<u>213,312</u>	<u>163,130</u>	<u>976,537</u>
4. ADA PARATRANSIT EXPENSES (line 3, Table 5)	<u>6,779</u>	<u>7,374</u>	<u>8,593</u>	<u>9,178</u>	<u>10,630</u>	<u>9,369</u>	<u>51,924</u>
5. ADA PARATRANSIT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL COSTS (line 4 divided by line 3)	<u>5.5%</u>	<u>5.3%</u>	<u>5.6%</u>	<u>5.0%</u>	<u>5.0%</u>	<u>5.7%</u>	<u>5.3%</u>

IN 1991, TOTAL SYSTEM COSTS (line 3) FOR OUR TRANSIT SYSTEM WERE \$ 122,168

* Total transit system costs encompass all system costs, not just ADA-related costs. These transit system costs must include:
 (1) all fixed-route costs (bus, rail, etc.), plus (2) all paratransit expenses (ADA and non-ADA).

* Excludes OMAP costs

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

ADA ACCESSIBILITY: FIXED-ROUTE BUSES (Table 7)

	Actual 1990	Actual 1991	Actual 1992	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Est. 1995	Proj. 1996	Proj. 1997
BUSES IN ACTIVE FLEET								
1. Total Number of Buses	<u>523</u>	<u>526</u>	<u>579</u>	<u>580</u>	<u>592</u>	<u>*616</u>	<u>623</u>	<u>643</u>
2. Buses Without Lifts/Ramps	<u>204</u>	<u>166</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>108</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>50</u>
3. Buses With Pre-ADA Lifts/Ramps	<u>319</u>	<u>319</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>321</u>	<u>*334</u>	<u>334</u>	<u>334</u>
4. Buses With ADA Lifts/Ramps (meets Part 38 lift specifications)	<u>0</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>*165</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>259</u>
(Note: The sum of lines 2, 3, and 4 should equal line 1.)								
5. Percent With Lifts/Ramps (sum of lines 3 and 4, divided by line 1)	<u>61 %</u>	<u>68 %</u>	<u>76 %</u>	<u>84 %</u>	<u>82 %</u>	<u>81 %</u>	<u>82 %</u>	<u>92 %</u>

For 1995, provide an approximate estimate of the number of boardings where lifts/ramps were deployed on the fixed-route system: 100,050

For an average day, can you estimate the total number of persons with any disabilities that use your fixed-route service? (Do not include customers who normally use ADA paratransit service.) (Optional): _____

*Include 15 mini buses for AIS service

TOTAL "PARATRANSIT" VEHICLES USED BY YOUR SYSTEM * (Table 8)

TOTAL NUMBER IN ACTIVE FLEET	Actual 1991	Actual 1992	Actual 1993	Actual 1994	Est. 1995	Proj. 1996	Proj. 1997
1. All Paratransit - Vans and Minivans *	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>
2. All Paratransit - Buses *	<u>104</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>140</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>*156</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>167</u>
3. Paratransit - Sedans/Wagons * (other than taxis)	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
LIFT-EQUIPPED PARATRANSIT VEHICLES							
4. Paratransit - Buses, Vans and Minivans * (with lifts/ramps from lines 1 and 2)	<u>111</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>183</u>

CONTRACTOR VEHICLES

5. For 1995, from lines 1 and 2, estimate the number of buses, vans, and minivans, etc., "OWNED" by your contractors that routinely provide paratransit (ADA and non-ADA) for your system. 38

Please estimate 1997 38

* Please include all dedicated paratransit vehicles (ADA or non-ADA service combined) used on your system. Include all paratransit vehicles your system owns or leases, as well as vehicles used from your contractors' fleet. Do not include any accessible vehicles used on the fixed-route.

*Excludes 15 mini buses used for ATS services
22 VII + 134 paratransit

SYSTEM NAME: Tri-Met

CITY: Portland

STATE: Oregon

YOUR ADA "PARATRANSIT" CUSTOMERS (Table 9)
(Please Make An Estimate Based On Actual Eligibility Determinations)

1. By 1995, how many persons had been certified as ADA paratransit eligible by your system? 12,000
- By 1997, please project how many people will be certified? 17,000
2. Using the 1990 Census, what is the total population of your service area? _____
3. Of those certified, can you estimate the percent who are ages... (Optional)
- 0 to 16 years old _____% 17 to 61 _____% 62 to 70 _____% Over 70 _____%
4. Of those eligible for ADA paratransit, how many are employed? (Optional) _____
5. Of those ADA paratransit eligible, what percent have as their most limiting or qualifying impairment... (Optional, should total 100%)
- Sensory Impairments (Visual, Hearing) _____ %
- Mobility Impairments Requiring Adaptive Devices (Devices: Wheelchairs, Walkers, etc.) _____ %
- Mental, Cognitive or Developmental Impairments (including Alzheimers) _____ %
- Health Impairments (Heart Disease, MS, CP, Arthritis, Kidney Dysfunction, etc.) _____ %

Summary of public comment on Tri-Met's ADA Paratransit Plan Update:

The public hearing was held on October 18, 1995 as part of CAT's normal monthly meeting.

Testimony on the plan was received by three people covering three areas. Two were written comments and the other one was oral.

1. Tri-Met should consider providing service beyond the 3/4 mile corridor as required by ADA.

Tri-Met will continue to work with local communities to identify resources to address transportation needs for elderly and disabled customers whose trips are outside the 3/4 mile corridor as defined by the ADA. VTI and the Clackamas County Senior Transportation Consortium are ways in which we currently meet some of this demand.

2. Long waits on the telephone to make ride reservations.

Tri-Met will analyze telephone traffic flow to assure that all calls are answered by a ride reservationist within five minutes.

3. Excessive trip lengths.

Tri-Met is currently working with the local community to develop a measurable means to compare Paratransit trip length with fixed route trip length. Recently new Trip Planning software has been installed to allow this review and Tri-Met will be in compliance by January 1996. Tri-Met does currently provide service which results in 98 percent of all trips being completed within one hour.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2232 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORING THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION I-5/ HIGHWAY 217 SUBAREA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Date: October 27, 1995

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution endorses the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan. With the endorsement, Metro Council and JPACT recognize the subarea transportation plan as providing recommendations for further analysis of the subarea transportation system and for inclusion of the I-5/Highway 217 interchange design Alternative B as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update, Phase II.

TPAC has reviewed the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan and recommends approval of Resolution No. 95-2232.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Interchange History

Over the past decade, a number of designs to improve the I-5/Highway 217 Interchange have been considered. A design developed in the early 1990's that relied on substantial reconstruction of the interchange and the use of a collector-distributor road system was abandoned in 1993. This design did not meet the needs of both regional and local traffic. A "down-scaled" design, referred to as the Phoenix Design, was suggested later in 1993. This design addressed the freeway-to-freeway movements, but some local traveling deficiencies remained and local access between Lake Oswego and Tigard was restricted. As a result, the Phoenix Design was not accepted as an effective solution by local jurisdictions and businesses in the area. The I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Plan encompasses a larger project area than previously considered and recommends both system and interchange transportation projects. The plan's purpose is to identify solutions to the transportation needs in the subarea that provide a reasonable and balanced system to accommodate local, regional, and statewide travel demand within and through the I-5/Highway 217 project area.

Subarea Transportation Plan

The subarea transportation plan recommendations are identified in Exhibit A. There are two major components to the recommendations, the interchange design alternative recommendation and the transportation system recommendation.

The recommended interchange design, referred to as Alternative B, was one of six major interchange design alternatives analyzed, and provides for full freeway-to-freeway movements without traffic signals. Alternative B also provides for all movements to/from Kruse Way and 72nd Avenue to/from Highway 217 and I-5. Exhibit A describes the interchange recommendation in more detail.

The transportation system recommendation builds upon programmed and planned improvements in the I-5/Highway 217 subarea with a number of roadway widening projects recommended for further public review and analysis. Pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements, transportation demand management strategies and additional transit service planning are recommended in order for the interchange and subarea to function at an acceptable level. Exhibit A describes the transportation system recommendations in more detail.

Process

The key steps in the planning process are described in Exhibit A. A Steering Group of 55 members and a Project Management Team made up of sponsoring jurisdictions identified issues, project alternatives and recommendations over a 10-month period. The six sponsoring jurisdictions include ODOT Region 1, Metro, Clackamas County, Washington County, the City of Lake Oswego and the City of Tigard.

Four Steering Group meetings were held to identify issues and evaluate existing conditions, define a range of plan alternatives, define a preferred system plan, and make final plan recommendations. Three open house public workshops were attended by an average of 200 persons per workshop. Four project newsletters were published and distributed; an information hotline was used extensively by the public; and over 250 written comments were received from concerned citizens.

The I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan was completed in October 1995, with the Steering Group making a preferred alternative recommendation to the Project Management Team. At this step in the process, the plan is being forwarded to each of the sponsoring jurisdictions for endorsement or adoption.

Key Findings

The I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan includes recommendations for improvements at the interchange and on nearby regional and local roads. The subarea transportation plan was developed to be consistent with other regional planning efforts, including the Region 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional Transportation Plan Update.

Interchange Recommendation. A number of preliminary interchange designs, including the 1993 Phoenix Design, were developed and

analyzed to identify operational benefits and weaknesses, costs, land acquisition constraints, safety concerns, and other issues. Two alternatives, the Phoenix Design and Interchange Alternative B, moved into a comprehensive technical analysis.

Both the Phoenix Interchange Alternative and Interchange Alternative B serve freeway traffic with free-flowing connections between I-5 and Highway 217 without passing through traffic signals. However, the Phoenix Interchange eliminates local movements that currently exist between Kruse Way and 72nd Avenue and 72nd Avenue to I-5 northbound, while Interchange Alternative B serves movements between Kruse Way and 72nd Avenue, and 72nd Avenue to I-5 northbound by extending Kruse Way to the west to 72nd Avenue.

Interchange Alternative B was identified as the preferred interchange. Other significant factors that went into the selection of Alternative B include maintenance of long-term acceptable operation, maintenance of the current Kruse Way structure over I-5, coordination with long-term plans for future widening of Highway 217, ability to construct in phases, and less right-of-way acquisition.

Subarea Transportation System Recommendation. Seven combinations of improvements to the subarea transportation system were analyzed, including an alternative to make no improvements to the interchange and implement only those transportation system improvements that are already funded. The remaining alternatives included the Phoenix design and Interchange Alternative B design. With the recommended Interchange Alternative B design, the system alternatives included the following:

- Build the Alternative B Design and implement funded transportation system improvements.
- Build the Alternative B Design and implement existing plans and policies for transportation improvements.
- Build the Alternative B Design, implement existing plans and policies for transportation improvements, and additional projects to improve transportation.

The recommended transportation system includes the Alternative B interchange, implementation of existing plans and policies, and additional projects subject to further review and analysis. Multi-modal road widening projects include Highway 99W, 72nd Avenue, Kruse Way, Bonita Road, Carman Drive and adding a crossing over Highway 217 from Hunziker Street to Dartmouth Street. Other system recommendations include further study of suburban transit service planning, improvements to bikeways and sidewalks at the interchange and on surface streets, and inclusion of transportation demand management strategies.

Implementation. The Implementation section in Exhibit A describes further technical work as well as alternative funding strategies necessary to implement the preferred interchange

design and the transportation system improvements recommended in the plan. Existing programmed funds in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) total \$21.7 million. Interchange Alternative B can be constructed in two phases. The estimated cost of Phase 1 is \$39.5 million, a shortfall of \$17.8 million. The estimated cost of Phase II construction is \$7.7 million.

TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council endorsement is the next step in the implementation process, prior to ODOT proceeding with final I-5/Highway 217 interchange design. The next steps toward implementation for ODOT include final design in late 1995, with construction scheduled for 1998. Right-of-way acquisition will occur in about one year. ODOT will continue to work with Metro to obtain any additional funds needed for Phase I construction. Also, the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan system recommendations will be considered as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update in 1996.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 95-2232.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 95-2232
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTA-)
TION I-5/HIGHWAY 217 SUBAREA) Introduced by
TRANSPORTATION PLAN) Councilor Rod Monroe,
JPACT Chair

WHEREAS, The State of Oregon, acting by and through its Oregon Transportation Commission, has caused to be prepared and submitted to JPACT and the Metro Council a transportation plan for the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea for a resolution of support; and

WHEREAS, Said plan has been developed in collaboration with representatives of the cities and counties within the transportation subarea in consultation with key stakeholders and the public in the transportation subarea; and

WHEREAS, Said plan recommends two major components, the interchange design Alternative B and transportation system recommendation; and

WHEREAS, The I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan interchange and transportation system recommendations will guide development of local and regional Transportation System Plans for the subarea; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That JPACT and the Metro Council:

1. Accept this Subarea Transportation Plan.
2. Direct that the revised interchange design Alternative B be included in the RTP financially constrained network.
3. Urge adoption of interchange design Alternative B by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

4. Direct that the interagency consultation process to determine regional air quality conformity analysis be initiated.

5. Direct Metro staff to work with local governments and the public to develop the I-5/Highway 217 subarea local transportation system circulation plan element in coordination with local transportation system plans, the Waluga Triangle Study, the Tigard Triangle Study, and Phase II of the RTP Update, and to include a 2040 land use review.

6. Direct Metro staff to review transit system and transportation demand management recommendations in the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan for consistency with and/or inclusion in other ongoing transportation studies.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____,

1995.

J. Ruth McFarland, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

Exhibit A


I-5 / Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan

Briefing Packet


October, 1995

I-5/Highway 217 Interchange Subarea Transportation Plan

Decision Process



I-5/Highway 217 Interchange Subarea Transportation Plan Participatory Planning Process



PROJECT GOAL:

Identify solutions to the transportation needs in the subarea that provide a reasonable and balanced system to accommodate local, regional, and statewide travel demand within and through the I-5/Highway 217 project area.

This project goal will be achieved by identifying transportation improvement projects and implementation strategies within the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan that balance the following Project Objectives.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES: (Not listed in order of priority)

1 Develop the I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan in an open public forum where involvement of local governments, citizens, business and transportation users is actively solicited and respected.

3 Develop a transportation system plan that provides for safe and convenient alternative modes including transit, bicycling and walking.

the Regional Transportation Plan;
 C. The Oregon Transportation Plan; and
 D. State and Federal environmental regulations.


4 Develop transportation improvement strategies that support existing and future Comprehensive Plan land uses, provide opportunities for continued economic development, and facilitate efficient movement of commerce throughout the area.

5 Ensure future transportation improvements support neighborhood livability by:

- A. Improving safety and opportunities for walking, bicycling, and access to transit;
- B. Supporting existing and planned land use patterns;
- C. Minimizing transportation-related environmental impacts; and
- D. Incorporating aesthetic considerations.

6 Ensure proposed transportation improvements are consistent with applicable local, regional, state and federal plans and adopted by implementing regulations, including:

- A. The Comprehensive Plan of local jurisdictions;
- B. Metro 2040 Growth Concept and



THE EFFICIENT MOVEMENT OF GOODS AND COMMERCE THROUGH THE REGION IS VITAL TO ITS ECONOMY.



NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND LIVABILITY ISSUES ARE IMPORTANT PLAN CONSIDERATIONS.

2 Identify a transportation system hierarchy within the study area that:

- A. Accommodates local, regional, and statewide access and circulation needs in a safe and efficient manner;
- B. Reduces conflicts between various transportation modes and travel movements; and
- C. Is compatible with and supports existing and future Comprehensive Plan land uses.

7 Develop a transportation improvement program for the area that is cost-effective, identifies funding responsibilities, is attainable within reasonable funding expectations, and is prioritized to identify near term solutions at the I-5/Highway 217 Interchange and throughout the subarea.

RECOMMENDED INTERCHANGE


This project team narrowed the conceptual interchange alternatives from six alternatives to three - Phoenix, Interchange B, and Interchange B-Modified. The Phoenix design remained under consideration because it was the design most recently proposed for development by ODOT. While this interchange has shortcomings, it does provide for the dominant freeway-to-freeway movements at a given financial cost.

After a number of technical sessions with ODOT design staff, Interchange Alternative B was identified as the preferred interchange. The Project Management Team and Steering Group concurred with this recommendation.

Relative to all interchange alternatives evaluated, the most significant factors that went into the selection of Alternative B as the preferred alternative were:


- Maintains long-term acceptable operation of freeway-to-freeway movements.
- Maintains long-term operation of Interstate 5.
- Restores the access between Kruse Way and 72nd Avenue that was eliminated with the Phoenix interchange design.
- Can be constructed in phases if necessary.
- Maintains the current Kruse Way structure over I-5.
- Matches long-term plans for future widening improvements on Highway 217.
- Minimizes right-of-way requirements.

The following two figures illustrate the Recommended Interchange for the first and second phases. A digital image of what the completed interchange might look like is also included.



Interchange B (Phase I)

I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan



Interchange B (Phase 2)

I-5/Highway 217 Subarea Transportation Plan



FIGURE
2

Digital Imaging by: W&H PACIFIC



Digitally enhanced photograph illustrating Alternative B - Phase II.

I-5 / Highway 217 / Kruse Way

Comparison of Alternative B

with the

Phoenix Design

Alternative B Phase 1 Review

Pros: Improves long term acceptable operation for most freeway to freeway moves.

Improves long term operation of I-5 mainline.

Alt. B Phase 1 may operate better and last longer than Phoenix.

No work on Kruse Way structure over I-5.

Cons:Phase 1 more expensive than Phoenix.

Requires 11' travel lanes under the 72nd. structure.

Sight distance problems for fly-under / fly-over structures. Protective screening problems etc.

Sight distance problems for EB Kruse Way to see SB ramp terminal intersection.(structure, horizontal and vertical curve).

R/W acquisition required for one business, Western Family Food Offices.

Substandard lane and shoulder widths for Kruse Way on structure over I-5.

Closely spaced exit/exit on northbound I-5. May cause congestion and may be difficult to sign.

Requires dropping two auxiliary lanes consecutively on SB I-5 at the Carmen exit and under the structure.

Doesn't solve future problems at Bangy Intersection and 72nd. system

Visual impacts of bridges and retaining wall.

B Phase 1 Cost Estimate

Phase	Engineering \$ (millions)	Construction \$ (millions)	R/W \$ (millions)	Totals (millions)
I	\$1.1	\$36.2	\$2.2	\$39.5
	Currently	Programmed		
	\$.7	\$14.6	\$6.4	\$21.7

B Phase 2 Alt. Review


Pros: Removes SB 217 to NB I-5 from Kruse and improves Kruse/Bangy intersection operation.

Cons: Still doesn't solve 72nd. Ave. system operation.

Additional visual impact of flyover from SB 217 to NB I-5.

B Phase 2 Cost Estimate

Phase	Engineering \$ (millions)	Construction \$ (millions)	R/W \$ (millions)	Totals (millions)
I	\$1.1	\$36.2	\$2.2	\$39.5
II	\$0	\$7.7	\$0	\$7.7
-----		-----	-----	-----
I & II	\$1.1	\$43.9	\$2.2	\$47.2
	Currently	Programmed		
	\$.7	\$14.6	\$6.4	\$21.7



ALTERNATIVE B

Phoenix Alternative Review

Pros: Improves long term acceptable operation for most freeway to freeway moves.

Improves long term operation of I-5 mainline.

Provides better long term alignment (shoulders on O'ring, better ramp alignment).

Least disruption of existing system during construction than other alternatives.

Less visual impact with no flyover structures and fewer retaining walls as compared to the other alternatives.

Fewer lanes on I-5 between Kruse Way and Carmen both NB and SB.

New I-5 overcrossing will meet seismic standards.

Cons: Doesn't solve future problems at Bangy Intersection and 72nd. system

R/W acquisition of two businesses, Coiltron and Western Family Food Offices. (However, the design might be able to be refined to avoid impacting Coiltron).

Does not provide direct access to and from Kruse Way to 72nd. Access would need to be from Bonita Rd. or Carmen Dr. Also does not provide direct access from 72nd. to northbound I-5; would need to use Haines IC.

WB Kruse Way to SB I-5 has unconventional left hand entrance onto SB 217 to SB I-5 ramp.

Requires merging 2 lanes of WB Kruse Way to 1 lane; and has a left hand entrance into 217.

Insufficient storage distance for ramp meter from westbound Kruse Way to southbound I-5. (Unable to meter Kruse to 217 NB.)

More "throw away" costs associated with future 217 improvements.

Phoenix Cost Estimate

Engineering \$ (millions)	Construction \$ (millions)	R/W \$ (millions)	Total (millions)
\$0.7	\$20.3	\$4.2	\$25.2
	Currently	Programmed	
\$0.7	\$14.6	\$6.4	\$21.7

217

72ND AVENUE

HAMPTON STREET

KRUSE WAY


BANGY ROAD

BONITA ROAD

CARMAN DRIVE

UPPER BOONES
FERRY ROAD

PHOENIX DESIGN



RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The following section presents the recommendations for the subarea transportation plan. These improvements would ensure that the interchange is accessible and separate traffic destined to the interchange from areas such as the Tigard Triangle and intra-subarea traffic.

The Steering Group members recognized that, given existing funding constraints, pursuit of the local system improvements in this recommendation is ambitious. The Project Management Team and the Steering Group did concur that these recommendations make the most sense from an operations standpoint.

There are several elements of the recommendation that are necessary for the interchange to work as designed. Other elements may be desirable over the next 20 years from a local transportation system perspective, while others stand a low chance of ever being implemented.

The recommended improvements are not meant to remedy all of the transportation problems within the subarea. The number of recently completed and proposed studies in the area, including Metro's 2040 Plan and Regional Transportation Plan, city and county transportation system plans, *Tigard Triangle Update Study*, and *Waluga Triangle Land Use and Transportation Plan*, attests to the need for coordination of improvements in this area. These studies and planning processes will be the basis for integrating the interchange needs with the other competing needs of the transportation system users of the subarea.

Based on the comments received, the recommended transportation system includes the Alternative B interchange, implementation of existing plans and policies (including bringing existing facilities up to adopted design standards) and the following improvements. These improvements are recommended for further public review and analysis in the local and regional transportation planning processes:

Highway 99W: 6 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from I-5 to south of Hwy. 217;
72nd Avenue: 4 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from Bonita to Hwy. 99 (Incl. diamond interchange and Hunziker/Hampton Flyover);
Bonita: 4 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from Hall to Bangy; 2 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from Bangy to Carman;
Carman: 2 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from I-5 to Kruse;
Dartmouth to Hunziker: 3 lane new crossing of Hwy. 217;
Dartmouth: 4 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from 72nd to 68th;
Kruse: 6 lanes (plus turn lanes at intersections) from Bangy to Boones Ferry, developed in phases.

DISCUSSION OF IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Highway 99W: Widen to 6 lanes plus turn lanes, from I-5 to south of Hwy. 217 - This is desirable from a traffic operations standpoint. However, the cost, in terms of right-of-way acquisition and loss of businesses, could make the project cost-prohibitive and politically unfeasible. Other solutions may be needed to reduce congestion in this corridor.

Recommendation: Retain under consideration, as it is part of existing adopted plans. Examine implementation strategies, including access management programs, creation of a transportation management association, improved transportation system management/transportation demand management in Tigard and regional plans. This is consistent with the recommendations of the *Tigard Triangle Update Study*.

72nd Avenue: Widen to 4 lanes plus turn lanes from Bonita to Hwy. 99 (Incl. diamond interchange and Hunziker/Hampton Flyover). Widening 72nd is necessary to accommodate the anticipated growth in the Tigard Triangle. The current interchange is inefficient, and the bridge will ultimately need replacement to accommodate five lanes (two through lanes in each direction plus turning lanes for the interchange ramps). Bridge replacement will adversely impact the existing interchange ramps. The Hunziker/ Hampton flyover has shown some merit as a local transportation system improvement, although there may be properties that would be rendered undevelopable.

Recommendation: Tigard should incorporate a 4/5-lane section for 72nd into their Transportation System Plan update. Tigard should also consider incorporation of the flyover. This is in agreement with the recommendations of the *Tigard Triangle Update Study*, completed this year.

Durham Rd: Widen to 5 lanes from Highway 99 to I-5. This action shows some merit as an improvement for accessing the Carman interchange. Recent street improvements in this area, along with development along the road, suggest that widening from three to five lanes is not likely.

Recommendation: Leave Durham Rd. as shown in existing plans and policies (3 lanes).

Bonita: Widen to 4 lanes plus turn lanes at intersections from Hall to Bangy; reconstruct to standard 2 lanes plus turn lanes at intersections from Bangy to Carman;

Carman: Reconstruct to standard 2 lane cross-section plus turn lanes at intersections from I-5 to Kruse. Widening Bonita west of I-5 is needed to accommodate traffic from 72nd and growth in the southwest interchange quadrant. The improvements east of I-5 are needed to maintain the system hierarchy of major collectors on the east side of I-5. The congestion anticipated along Kruse Way in the 20-year horizon shows a need to accommodate non-freeway trips on the local arterial/collector network. Without these improvements, traffic may seek less congested paths through the neighborhoods. The improvement to Carman is consistent with the 1992 Lake Oswego Public Facilities plan.

Recommendation: Lake Oswego and Clackamas County should amend their transportation plans to include future development of Carman and Bonita to a major collector standard. Tigard should include widening Bonita to 4/5 lanes between Hall and Bangy.

Dartmouth to Hunziker: Construct a new 3 lane crossing of Hwy. 217;
Dartmouth: Widen to 4 lanes plus turn lanes from 72nd to 68th. The new crossing of Highway 217 provides some relief for Highway 99W. Widening Dartmouth would provide improved access to/from the Haines interchange, which could attract trips away from the subject interchange.

Recommendation: Tigard should consider including the new overcrossing as a local transportation system improvement. The widening should be considered by Tigard as a project to improve access to I-5 and the Tigard Triangle. This recommendation is in agreement with the recommendations of the *Tigard Triangle Update Study*.

Kruse: Widen to 6 lanes from Bangy to Boones Ferry. This project is necessary to provide adequate access to the interchange and to provide for east-west circulation to keep arterial traffic off of the local street system. Because of the configuration of the various ramps and Kruse Way, the section of Kruse way between I-5 and Westlake will need to be six lanes at the time the interchange is operational. Volume estimates, including turning movements into the neighborhoods to the north and business and neighborhoods to the south, show that six lanes will be needed along the entire segment to accommodate the 2015 demand.

Recommendation: Lake Oswego and Clackamas County should include widening Kruse Way to six lanes, initially between I-5 and Westlake, and ultimately to Boones Ferry in their Transportation System Plans. Creation of a transportation management association (TMA) in this area, as described in the *Waluga Triangle Land Use and Transportation Plan* and initial development studies, should be implemented.

OTHER SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

As with the roadway improvements, these system elements are believed to be needed in order for the interchange and subarea to function at an acceptable level.

Pedestrian and Bicycle: When existing surface streets are rehabilitated or upgraded, sidewalks and bicycle lanes appropriate to the street's functional classification should be constructed. Pathways and trails in the local jurisdiction plans should be implemented as defined. While the interchange includes pedestrian and bicycle facilities, there is a need to explore alternative systems on surface streets which may provide a lower cost and more effective routing for users.

Public Transportation: There is a need for Tri-Met to conduct a Southwest Subarea study which would quantify the changing commuter and social travel patterns of Southwest Portland, Tigard, Lake Oswego and unincorporated areas. Current transit system plans do not address the change from suburb-to-central city commute to suburb-to-suburb commute, and continue to focus on the central city. Current and planned development patterns, including the 2040 concept, and other changes would be used to identify a system that may be more productive than that currently proposed.

The end result would be to develop a service plan to meet the local and regional needs of the study area as both an employment and residential base.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM): As part of regional and local transportation plans, transportation system management elements are being supported. These include use of alternate work hours, telecommuting, use of alternate modes of travel, and provision of worksite incentives and amenities to encourage use of travel modes other than single occupant vehicles. Within the study area, there are numerous opportunities for an array of TDM actions to be implemented which could result in a reduction of peak period vehicular demand on the road system.




FIGURE 3 - RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

I-5/HIGHWAY 217 SUBAREA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

INTERCHANGE B WITH SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS



IMPLEMENTATION

There are three areas where further work is needed in order to make the transportation improvement plans a reality: technical, funding and strategy. A schematic diagram of the timing of these actions is presented after this discussion. The following is a summary of what steps are needed within each of these areas. The recommended strategy is to pursue a new gas tax or other state-based funding mechanism (see 5A below).

TECHNICAL

1. Wait for TPAC/JPACT and Oregon Transportation Commission approval before proceeding with final design (anticipated in November, 1995).
2. Get FHWA approval of design concept.
3. Conduct air quality "hot spot" analysis.
4. Reconfirm that a "Major Investment Study" is not needed.
5. Prepare Transportation Operations Tech Memo.
6. Prepare Drainage/Water Quality/Mitigation Plan.
7. Update right of way area and cost estimates.
8. Assure compliance with Metro Congestion Management System.
9. Confirm that a new EA or EIS is not needed.

These activities should be completed by the end of 1995. The primary responsibility lies with ODOT for their completion.

FUNDING

Existing Programmed funds in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):

Engineering	700,000
ROW	6,400,000
Construction	<u>14,600,000</u>
TOTAL	\$21,700,000

Phase 1 Alternative B:

Engineering	\$1,100,000 (est.)
ROW	2,200,000
Construction	<u>36,200,000</u>
TOTAL	\$39,500,000

Shortfall is about \$17.8 million assuming that ROW surplus may be converted to construction dollars. It is about \$22,000,000 if ROW surplus cannot be converted. The current ODOT information is that it cannot be converted.

Phase II Alternative B:

Construction	7,700,000
--------------	-----------

Total shortfall is about \$29.7 million assuming ROW funds cannot be used for construction.

The concept of a large project Steering Group was identified to serve two purposes. The first was to gather as many ideas as possible and assure representation of key interest groups in the study area. The second purpose was to gather a group of community leaders who can serve as project advocates as the solution identified by the Steering Group moves toward implementation.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

1. ADOPT ALTERNATIVE B

A. TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council briefing on the selected alternative and funding implications, along with Sunset Highway, I-5 to 99W Expressway, I-5 and other top priority projects in the region.

B. Presentation/approval from Oregon Transportation Commission of interchange plan and funding strategy (Steering Group members invited to make presentation in support of project).

C. Develop documentation on why the selected alternative is appropriate: I-5 traffic operations, cost-benefit, Region 2040 consistency, community support.

2. DEVELOP PROJECT COST AND REVENUE INFORMATION (ODOT Region 1 and statewide)

A. Develop documentation on revenue projections for 1999-2000; acknowledge that a new funding source (such as gas tax increase) is needed and bonds can be issued against future revenue stream to keep project on schedule.

B. Develop documentation on the cost of high priority major projects (Sunset Highway, I-5 to 99W Expressway, I-5 and others). Money can not be spent on this interchange and ignore other needs.

3. DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR PUBLIC AND LEGISLATURE

A. Provide letter and other materials to legislators on importance of various projects, costs, revenue projections and need for gas tax increase.

B. Develop public information/media releases on project, costs, revenues, et cetera, including information that there is no money elsewhere in the state to transfer to this project.

4. DEVELOP AND APPROVE LOCAL TSPs AND AMENDMENTS

A. Metro and local governments develop and adopt local TSPs, including approvals of interchange and subarea improvements.

B. Develop agreements with Lake Oswego, Tigard, Clackamas Co., Washington Co., and Metro regarding land use, transportation impacts et cetera in the study area.

C. Develop agreements to commit to a phasing program wherein the timing of ODOT freeway improvements are alternated with local improvements.

5. RECOMMENDED FUNDING STRATEGY -

A. Identify new statewide money sources (gas tax increases? other legislative package?). Possible use of bonding against this source to speed construction schedule.

6. CONSIDERED FUNDING STRATEGIES - Options included (in no particular order)

- A. Delay or delete existing ODOT projects -
 - 1. STIP may be over-programmed as it is; there may be a need to delete projects just to balance the existing STIP;
 - 2. Not many projects in the 1998-99 fiscal years to delay;
 - 3. Difficult political decision.
- B. Capture funds from any ODOT/Regional project programmed for 1996-98 that are delayed or stopped for any reason -
 - 1. No such projects identified.
- C. Tap into potential Regional Arterial Fund (Regional Gas Tax supported):
 - 1. Uncertain regional support;
 - 2. More appropriate to fund local improvements in study area.
- D. Phase/Delay Alternative B until funds are accumulated -
 - 1. Final engineering, air quality, environmental, et cetera in the next two years;
 - 2. Right of way in FY '98-99;
 - 3. Construction after 2000.
- E. Identify other new money sources -
 - 1. Cities or Counties?
 - 2. Federal (ISTEA reauthorization?)
 - 3. Bonding against same source of funds as above?
- F. Creative funding sources -
 - 1. Congestion pricing;
 - 2. Tolling;
 - 3. Public-private partnerships.

I-5/Highway 217 Interchange Implementation Schedule

TASK or ACTION	OCT. '95	NOV. '95	DEC. '95	1st Third '96	2nd Third '96	3rd Third '96	JAN. '97
TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES							
Air Quality Review	█	█	█				
Environmental Confirmation	█	█	█				
Drainage				█			
FHWA Approval				█			
Engineering Plans				█	█	█	█
Right-Of-Way Acquisition				█	█	█	
POLICY ACTIONS							
Interchange Specific							
Steering Group Endorsement	█						
TPAC/JPACT Endorsement		█					
OTC Endorsement		█					
Subarea Transportation Plan							
Incorporate Into Local TSPs			█	█	█	█	█
FUNDING STRATEGY							
Develop Strategy	█	█	█	█			
Regional Arterial Fund Vote					█	█	█
Implement Strategy					█	█	█
LEGISLATIVE SESSION							█
STEERING GROUP/CITIZEN ACTIONS							
OTC		█	█				
Letter/Speaking Campaign				█	█	█	█

Proposed I-5/Highway 217 Interchange



Digital Imaging by W&H PACIFIC

Digitally enhanced photograph illustrating Alternative B - Phase II.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 95-2235 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING REGION 2040 EARLY IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES FOR TRANSPORTATION

Date: October 31, 1995

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would adopt Region 2040 early implementation measures related to transportation. The intent of these actions is to support increased density in specific areas, and thereby demonstrate a reduction in the number of acres that must be added to the urban area to accommodate projected growth.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2709 in 1995 which requires Metro to demonstrate that anticipated growth can be accommodated within the region's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) either by expansion or by more compact development. Under HB 2709, the need for land in the UGB must be based upon enforceable actions implemented through Metro functional plans or local comprehensive plans which can reasonably be expected to be market-feasible.

The Metro Council requested that the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) identify land use and transportation measures that would accelerate implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept. If early implementation measures are not adopted, requirements for compliance with the Growth Concept would not be in place until after adoption of the Regional Framework Plan, scheduled for 1997.

Adoption of the early implementation measures would allow the region to reduce or eliminate the need for expansion of the UGB and still meet the requirements of House Bill 2709. In addition, adoption of this resolution will ensure that new development is consistent with the Region 2040 Growth Concept and that this consistency begins sooner rather than later.

During September and October 1995, MPAC and the Metro Council requested staff to identify possible land use actions for consideration as early implementation measures to jump-start the Region 2040 Growth Concept. Based on this direction, staff recommended several land use and parking measures as early implementation measures. MPAC and the Metro Council also requested that JPACT identify Region 2040 early implementation measures for transportation that can ultimately be adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan and local Transportation System Plans. These measures were reviewed and recommended for

forwarding to JPACT by the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) at their October 27, 1995 meeting. This staff report and resolution identify the recommended transportation-related measures for consideration by the Metro Council as early implementation measures for the Region 2040 Growth Concept.

The early implementation measures identified in this resolution complement a number of transportation efforts which are already underway in the region including local implementation of the Transportation Planning Rule requirements; activities related to the Westside Light Rail Transit Station Area planning process and associated implementing ordinances; initiation of the region's congestion pricing study; initiation of a tollway study for the Tualatin Expressway; and continued fast-tracking of planning for the South/North High Capacity Transit Corridor.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 95-2235.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING REGION) RESOLUTION NO. 95-2235
2040 EARLY IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES)
FOR TRANSPORTATION) Introduced by
Mike Burton,
Executive Officer

WHEREAS, The Oregon Legislature in 1995, through passage of House Bill 2709, requires that the Portland metropolitan area demonstrate that anticipated growth can be accommodated within the region's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) either by expansion of the UGB or by more compact design; and

WHEREAS, The need for land in the UGB must be based upon enforceable actions implemented through Metro functional plans or local comprehensive plans which can reasonably be expected to be market-feasible; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council adopted by resolution the Region 2040 Growth Concept on December 8, 1994; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council and the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) are considering land use actions that can be implemented to reduce or eliminate the need for expansion of the UGB by accelerating implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council and MPAC requested that the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) identify transportation actions that would accelerate implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept; and

WHEREAS, The following transportation actions which are in support of the Region 2040 Growth Concept are underway:

- . Local governments in the Portland metropolitan area will implement the legislative requirement to partially reduce System Development Charges in pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-oriented development areas;
- . Metro and local governments have nearly completed the Westside Light Rail Transit Station Area planning process and are scheduled to adopt implementing ordinances;
- . Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) have initiated a study of congestion pricing in the region;
- . ODOT has initiated a study of implementing the Tualatin Expressway as a toll facility; and
- . Metro has initiated the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the South/North High Capacity Transit Corridor; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That the Metro Council adopts the following transportation measures to accelerate implementation of the Region 2040 Growth Concept:

1. Accelerate adoption of the revised policy framework for the Regional Transportation Plan to address:
 - new standards for defining congestion;
 - new roadway design guidelines, particularly in high density, mixed use areas to ensure designs are compatible with intended land uses;
 - encouragement of new "skinny street" standards, better street connectivity and fewer cul-de-sac

streets in residential areas;

- establishment of modal targets for each Region 2040 land use type to achieve the VMT per capita reduction requirement and serve as the basis for implementing modal improvements into and within these areas; and
- 2. Accelerate implementation by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) of the Employee Commute Options (ECO) Program;
- 3. Define methods to protect needed roadway capacity for trucks;
- 4. Ensure the proposed project list for the Regional Arterial Program is supportive of the Region 2040 Growth Concept;
- 5. Request Tri-Met to define key transit capital and service improvements targeted at high density, mixed use areas to be the basis for their ballot measure to be considered in 1996;
- 6. Work with MPAC, JPACT and DEQ to reduce required parking ratios and establish voluntary maximum parking ratios as early implementation measures but to defer definition of maximum parking ratios to the Regional Framework Plan at a later date. These actions will help reduce VMT per capita and parking spaces per capita (as required by the Transportation Planning Rule), help reduce land consumption and increase densities and help the region meet and maintain federal

air quality standards; and

7. Continue pursuing actions to encourage and provide incentives for transit-oriented development.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____,
1995.

J. Ruth McFarland, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE JPACT

DATE 11-9-95

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ <u>[Signature]</u>	<u>Clackamas Co.</u>
✓ <u>Claudette LaVert</u>	<u>Cities of Mult. Co.</u>
✓ <u>David Lohman</u>	<u>Port of Portland</u>
✓ <u>Susan McLean</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ <u>DON MORISSETTE</u>	<u>METRO</u>
✓ <u>BARB WARNER</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ <u>Mike Burton</u>	<u>metro</u>
✓ <u>Red Monroe</u>	<u>Metro Council</u>
✓ <u>Andy Cohen</u>	<u>metro</u>
✓ <u>Bob Pat</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>
<u>GREG GREEN</u>	<u>DEU</u>
✓ <u>ROB DRAKE</u>	<u>CITIES OF WASH. CO.</u>
✓ <u>Earl Blumenauer</u>	<u>PORTLAND</u>
✓ <u>Pat Collmeyer</u>	<u>NGI</u>
✓ <u>Kate Whane</u>	<u>City of Portland</u>
✓ <u>STEVE DOTTERER</u>	<u>CITY OF PORTLAND</u>
✓ <u>GB ARNSTON</u>	<u>TRI-MET</u>
✓ <u>Gina Whitehill-Baziute</u>	<u>Metro</u>
✓ <u>Mary Bolay</u>	<u>Tri-Met</u>
✓ <u>RICH LEDBETTER</u>	<u>METRO</u>
✓ <u>Fred Eberle</u>	<u>ODOT</u>
✓ <u>BILL BRANDON</u>	<u>City of Happy Valley</u>
<u>Mike Hoglund</u>	<u>Metro</u>

COMMITTEE MEETING TITLE SPACT

DATE 11-9-95

NAME	AFFILIATION
✓ TANYA COLLIER	MULTNOMAH
✓ Les White	C-TRAN
✓ Skottle Chusman	City of Clackamas City
✓ Dean Lookingbill	RTA
✓ Mike Hoglund	Metro
✓ Susan Schneider	City of Portland - G.R.
Carol Kelsoy	Metro
✓ Elsa Coleman	City of Portland
✓ Kathy Buss	Multi-County
✓ Bonnie White	private citizen SW Portland
✓ Macky Stappard	City of Portland
✓ Kathy Lehtola	Washington County
✓ ROD SANDOZ	CLACKAMAS COUNTY
✓ CLARK WORTH	BARNES + WORTH, INC.
✓ Phil Paul	Metro
✓ Jay Mower	Hillsdale Vision Group
✓ Jim Collins	Metro
✓ Mike Mabeey	City of Gresham
✓ Jennifer Ball	Conling Fish and McCrumb
✓ Bernice Bottomly	Tri-Met
✓ JOHN ARROYO	NWCPC
✓ Susan Lee	Multi. Co.
✓ DAVE WILLIAMS	ODOT
Christine Marro (244-9796)	Resident near Gabriel Po