

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEFINING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 89-1075
SCOPE OF STUDY ELEMENTS WHICH) Introduced by Mike Ragsdale,
SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO ADDRESS) JPACT Chairman
BI-STATE TRAVEL


WHEREAS, After considerable review and public testimony JPACT has adopted a position paper (Exhibit A) on the Bi-State Transportation Study proposed by IRC of Clark County, Washington; and

WHEREAS, This attachment defines the scope of study elements which should be undertaken to address appropriate issues related to bi-state travel; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District hereby adopts the attached position paper.
2. That staff is directed to coordinate with affected jurisdictions to define budget implications for implementing these studies.
3. That the action is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan Update and Affirmative Intergovernmental Project Review is hereby given.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 27th day of April, 1989.



Mike Ragsdale, Presiding Officer

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS
COMMITTEE REPORT

Agenda Item No. 7.4

Meeting Date April 27, 1989

RESOLUTION NO. 89-1075, DEFINING THE SCOPE OF STUDY ELEMENTS WHICH SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN TO ADDRESS APPROPRIATE ISSUES RELATED TO BI-STATE TRAVEL

Date: April 19, 1989

Presented by: Councilor DeJardin

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: At the April 18, 1989 Intergovernmental Relations Committee meeting, members present -- Councilors Bauer, Devlin, Gardner and myself -- voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 89-1075. Councilor Collier was absent.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/ISSUES: Transportation Department Director Andy Cotugno presented Resolution No. 89-1075 which has been approved by both the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Technical Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC). As noted in the attached staff report, this resolution establishes bi-state travel planning principles and work elements for Metro to address regarding the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan areas. During JPACT and TPAC study reviews and public hearings, there was strong public resistance to including review of the western by-pass option as a bi-state transportation improvement until the Interstate 5 and 205 corridor areas have been thoroughly addressed. As a result, bi-state planning efforts (to be detailed within 90 days for inclusion with the Metro Unified Work Program) will cover two issues: 1) defining a long-range (more than 20 year) vision of future urban development as a regionwide (Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area) evaluation; and 2) evaluating 20-year transportation needs including an analysis of travel between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30, TSM strategies, and extension of the I-5 LRT north into Clark County.

The Committee reviewed the study's background and staff recalled Metro has performed bi-state travel studies and updates every 3 to 4 years at Clark County's request. Staff noted the driving force behind this bi-state study continues to be Clark County's interest in access to the rest of the metropolitan Oregon corridor. Staff noted Planning & Development's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Management Plan process will address the study's issues of defining a long-range "urban vision" for the Portland metropolitan region. The Vancouver urban growth management process is just beginning and Metro staff will work to coordinate, as much as possible, research efforts with Vancouver, Clark County and the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC). Metro's FY89-90 Proposed Transportation budget includes some elements which will contribute to the bi-state study but additional funding would be necessary if the need arises to speed up the process. Resolution No. 89-1075 does not obligate any expenditures for the study beyond work elements which have already been included in Transportation's proposed FY89-90 budget.

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 89-1075 FOR THE PURPOSE
OF DEFINING THE SCOPE OF STUDY ELEMENTS WHICH SHOULD BE
UNDERTAKEN TO ADDRESS APPROPRIATE ISSUES RELATED TO BI-
STATE TRAVEL

Date: March 20, 1989

Presented by: Andrew Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

The adoption of this resolution establishes the planning principles and work elements appropriate at this time for Metro to address certain issues related to bi-state travel as detailed in Exhibit A. After considerable review and public testimony before a JPACT ad hoc bi-state subcommittee, TPAC and JPACT approved this action.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In December 1988, the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC) of Clark County, Washington published its Legislative Study Interim Report, Columbia River Crossing Accessibility Study, authorized by the Washington State Legislature to "study the economic feasibility of constructing a bridge across the Columbia River to Oregon..." and develop findings to be presented to the 1989 legislative session.

Phase I (the Interim Report submitted to the Washington Legislature) presented an overview of an analysis of existing and forecast travel volumes and demand to capacity relationships in the Interstate 5 and Interstate 205 corridors. Based on the need identified in this analysis, IRC proposed a two-part Phase II study and Scope of Work to: a) identify future major transportation corridors based on both 2010 and longer-range (30-40 year) land use forecasts; and b) develop and evaluate alternative approaches to providing additional future capacity and accessibility across the Columbia River. IRC recommended that the Phase II scope should be jointly funded by Washington and Oregon during the 1989 legislative session.

To that end, IRC submitted the proposed scope of work for consideration and comment by TPAC and JPACT. In the course of that consideration, several problems with the proposed scope were identified. First, the committees determined that additional analysis was required to document the nature and definition of the 20-year need in relation to bi-state travel demand. In addition, the longer-range (20-40 year) regional objectives for

growth and urban form needed to be defined. Thirdly, several other transportation improvements (such as LRT extension into Clark County) were recommended for implementation prior to consideration of a new bridge.

As a result of considerable review and deliberation, public testimony, neighborhood and interest group meetings, and jurisdictional comment, the attached Position Paper on the Bi-State Transportation Study was approved by TPAC and JPACT. This statement of principles describes the overall context and work elements of planning efforts related to bi-state travel issues, and calls for:

- a) The definition of a long-range (more than 20 year) vision of future urban development undertaken as a regionwide evaluation by affected land use jurisdictions;
- b) An evaluation of 20-year transportation needs by Metro and IRC of Clark County, Washington which should include an analysis of travel between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30, TSM strategies, and extension of I-5 LRT north into Clark County; and
- c) Upon completion of a) and b) above, a determination of whether to proceed with a comprehensive evaluation of additional alternatives such as a third bridge.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 89-1075.

JAG:lmk
BS0320.RES

JPACT Position PaperBi-State Transportation StudyFindings

1. Bi-state travel is an important aspect of the Portland-Vancouver regional transportation system and it is in the best interest of the Portland-Vancouver region that this part of the system function properly. Of particular note are the following:
 - a. Peak-hour travel in the I-5 and I-205 corridors is of comparable importance as the other regional corridors although the severity of the transportation problem is not as great as that existing in other corridors;
 - b. Acceptable operation of I-5 during off-peak hours is important to truck operations into surrounding port, distribution and industrial locations;
 - c. I-205 is expected to function as an I-5 bypass for through traffic; and
 - d. Improved access to and from prospective lower Columbia River port development sites will become more important over time as Port of Portland properties become fully developed.
2. Improvements to I-5 are planned and funded to partially alleviate traffic problems on I-5. Furthermore, the I-205 bridge has surplus capacity and is capable of absorbing additional traffic growth. As such, the need for improvements to serve bi-state travel is a long-term rather than a short-term concern.
3. Several transportation issues that would be part of a comprehensive bi-state study merit further investigation irrespective of the scope and schedule of a bi-state study.
 - a. Cornelius Pass Road is inadequate to meet growing traffic problems between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30 and should be addressed irrespective of whether a western beltway is pursued.
 - b. LRT in the I-5 corridor has been identified as a viable transportation improvement from downtown Portland to Hayden Island or downtown Vancouver. Evaluation of an extension of this route into Clark County should be undertaken to determine whether it improves the viability of the corridor and to identify a potential route.

4. Likely transportation alternatives to serve bi-state travel could have significant impacts and benefits regionwide which must be carefully evaluated prior to embarking upon the improvement, including:
 - a. Consideration of whether or not to improve bi-state access raises significant questions regarding future growth patterns of the region that must be addressed in order to adequately determine long-range transportation needs;
 - Construction of new facilities through existing developed areas could have significant impact and identification of the need for and location of proposed facilities is important to preserve a right-of-way for future implementation.
 - Construction of new facilities through undeveloped areas could have significant impact on wetlands, forest lands, rivers and wildlife which must be carefully considered to avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
5. Insufficient information is available about the nature and volume of bi-state travel as well as the development objectives that would either be hindered by inaction or helped by possible improvements.

Proposed Actions

It is in the interest of the region to address bi-state travel concerns. It is important to better understand the nature of the long-range development and transportation issues in order to define the objectives to be met by improvement in bi-state accessibility. After the problems and objectives are properly defined, another decision will be required on whether or not to proceed with a comprehensive evaluation of alternative improvements. Aspects of the bi-state study that should be considered further are as follows:

- A. Land Use Planning - In order to properly define the bi-state transportation needs, it is important to first establish the land use plans to be served. As such, additional land use planning should be undertaken, as follows:
 - 1) In order to evaluate the needs for major bi-state transportation improvements, it is important to define the long-range regional objectives for growth and urban form. As such, a long-range (more than 20-year) future development vision for urbanization should be defined taking into consideration development constraints, economic development objectives, environmental concerns, the need

for public services, and implications to the Urban Growth Boundary.

This evaluation should be undertaken as a regionwide concern that includes adequate involvement throughout Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington and Clark Counties and takes into consideration development objectives of Columbia County. In addition, it should be carried out by the land use jurisdictions rather than the transportation jurisdictions.

- 3) The implication of not significantly improving bi-state accessibility should be evaluated to determine the severity of congestion problems and the long-term effect on development objectives.

B. Transportation Planning

The following transportation activities should be undertaken as a bi-state transportation accessibility study to address 20-year transportation needs:

- 1) Data and forecasts of bi-state travel movements should be improved and coordinated between Metro and Clark County IRC in order to agree on the scope of the problem to be addressed. This should include assessment of intra-regional and interstate freight movements.
- 2) Incremental improvements to the existing transportation system should be identified and the extent to which bi-state travel needs are met should be evaluated, including:
 - a. Implementation of planned improvements to I-5 at Portland Boulevard and at Marine Drive;
 - b. Implementation of incremental bus service expansion in the I-5 corridor;
 - c. Implementation of all feasible transportation system management strategies (e.g., ramp metering, bypass lanes for high-occupancy vehicles (HOV's), additional transit service, park-and-ride lots, employer-based incentive programs (such as flexible work hours, bus pass subsidies, priority parking for HOV's, etc.), intensified use of existing rail facilities, and variable message signs) to maximize the use of existing facilities;
 - d. Identification of needed improvements on I-405 and I-5;

- e. Identification of needed improvements to Cornelius Pass Road between U.S. 26 and U.S. 30; and
 - f. Determination of the bi-state travel needs of the elderly and handicapped community.
- 3) a. Re-evaluation of the timing of the proposed I-5 North LRT and evaluation of the viability of extending it into Clark County.
- b. Dependent upon the conclusion of item B.1 (above), re-examine the long-term feasibility of LRT in the I-205 corridor into Clark County.
- C. Upon definition of the regional development objectives and transportation problems affecting bi-state travel, alternative transportation improvements to be considered in a further bi-state study should be identified.
- D. Financial participation from Oregon in the comprehensive study recommended by Clark County Intergovernmental Resource Center to the Washington Legislative Transportation Committee is not recommended. Instead, an agreement should be reached between Oregon and Washington jurisdictions on the financing of the work elements described above. As such, the roles, responsibilities, financing and timing for the Washington and Oregon jurisdictions involved in the bi-state study effort should be defined through the annual budget process.

a:/bsstudy
3-13-89