

**A G E N D A**

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736



**METRO**

TEL 503-797-1540 FAX 503-797-1793

**MEETING: METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** May 26, 2004

**DAY:** Wednesday, 5:00-7:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Metro Council Chamber/Annex

NO	AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER	ACTION	TIME
	CALL TO ORDER	Becker		
1	INTRODUCTIONS	All		5 min.
2	ANNOUNCEMENTS	Becker		3 min.
3	CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS			3 min.
4	CONSENT AGENDA • Meeting Summary for April 28, 2004	Becker	Decision	5 min.
5	COUNCIL UPDATE	Bragdon		5 min.
6	ORDINANCE NO. 04-1045 Amending the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan for Consistency with the 2004 Interim Federal RTP and Statewide Planning Goals	Ellis	Information/ Discussion	5 min.
7	CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER RECOMMENDATION ORDINANCE 04-1040 For the Purpose of Amending the Urban Growth Boundary, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to Increase the Capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment	Neill	Decision	60 min.
8	REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS	Doug Rux/ Charlie Allcock	Briefing	30 min.

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

June 9, 2004 & June 23, 2004

For agenda and schedule information, call Kim Bardes at 503-797-1537. e-mail: bardes@metro.dst.or.us

MPAC normally meets the second and fourth Wednesday of the month.

To receive assistance per the Americans with Disabilities Act, call the number above, or Metro teletype 503-797-1804.

To check on closure or cancellations during inclement weather please call 503-797-1700.

METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING RECORD

May 12, 2004 – 5:00 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

**Committee Members Present:** Charles Becker, Nathalie Darcy, Rob Drake, Andy Duyck, Gene Grant, Ed Gronke, Judie Hammerstad, John Hartsock, Tom Hughes, Kent Hutchinson, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Deanna Mueller-Crispin, Doug Neeley, Martha Schrader, Larry Smith

**Alternates Present:** Larry Cooper, Tim Crail, Jim Bernard, Jack Hoffman, Erik Sten, Nick Wilson

**Also Present:** Hal Bergsma, City of Beaverton; Beverly Bookin, CCA/CREEC; Cindy Catto, AGC; Bob Clay, City of Portland; Valerie Counts, City of Hillsboro; Brent Curtis, Washington County; Bob Durgan, Anderson Construction; Meg Fernekees, DLCD; Mary Gibson, Port of Portland; Lincoln Herman, Stoe Rives; Laura Hudson, City of Vancouver; Gil Kelley, City of Portland; Jim Labbe, Audubon Society of Portland; Stephen Lashbrook, City of Lake Oswego; Charlotte Lehan, City of Wilsonville; Greg Leo, Coalition to Save the Valley; Sue Marshall, Tualatin Riverkeepers; Doug McClain, Clackamas County; Karen McKinney, City of Hillsboro; Rebecca Ocken, City of Gresham; Loretta Pickerell, Oregon League of Conservation Voters; Pat Ribellia, City of Hillsboro; Marty Stiven, Stiven Planning & Development; David Zagel, TriMet;

**Metro Elected Officials Present:** Liaisons – Carl Hosticka, Council District 3, Susan McLain, Council District 4; David Bragdon, Council President also present: Brian Newman, District 2

**Metro Staff Present:** Kim Bardes, Dick Benner, Andy Cotugno, Chris Deffebach, Paul Garrahan, Carol Krigger, Malu Wilkinson

## INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor Charles Becker, MPAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

### 1. ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Hartsock said that the Committee for the Future of Damascus had collected over 800 signatures and would be filing for incorporation of the City of Damascus on Monday, May 17<sup>th</sup>.

### 3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

### 4. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Summary for May 12, 2004.

Motion:	John Hartsock, Clackamas County Special Districts, with a second from Nathalie Darcy, Washington County Citizen, moved to adopt the consent agenda without revision.
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **5. COUNCIL UPDATE**

Council President Bragdon said that they had completed several public hearings on Goal 5 and the Industrial Land Expansion. He reviewed the Industrial Land Decision Process schedule and how it would impact MPAC. That schedule was available in the back of the room and is attached and forms part of the record. He said that the public hearings on Goal 5 were completed and the May 20<sup>th</sup> Council meeting would be in the evening in order to provide more access to the public. He said that the Council would appreciate their recommendation on Goal 5 by the end of the evening.

## **6. GOAL 5 RESOLUTION 04-3440**

Chris Deffebach handed out a corrected copy of Attachment 1 with a comparison of staff recommended Modified Option 2B with Goal 5 TAC/WRPAC and MTAC recommendations (yellow copy). That document is attached and forms part of the record. She also handed out Attachment 2: Key Issues for Council Consideration and responses (green copy), which is also attached and forms part of the record. Chris Deffebach then reviewed these materials, and materials from the packet, for the Fish & Wildlife Habitat Protection program.

Ed Gronke asked what the difference was between “strictly limit” and “strictly limit plus?”

Chris Deffebach said that there had been a lot of discussion as to whether there should be a “prohibit” recommendation. Part of the discussion had centered on recent cases that made it difficult to do anything at all in areas that had been designated for “prohibit.” With “strictly limit/plus” they were trying to designate areas that should be heavily protected, but could still provide for human use. For this designation, trails designated for human use would be compensated by increasing the functional value of the habitat. They hoped to set the highest standard, without completely prohibiting use.

Rob Drake said that, for governmental lands, it would be nice to be able to set some kind of example by having a “prohibit” designation providing that it did not interfere with something that was preplanned or that provided simple access to view wildlife or nature.

Chris Deffebach said it came down to legal interpretation of what “prohibit” meant.

Paul Garrahan said that what Chris Deffebach was referring to was a Portland case that basically said that if you meant “prohibit” then that really meant no conflicting use – nothing at all that in any way would conflict with the habitat. He gave an example of some natural areas that were protected but were also purchased and owned by water service providers. At some point in the future those properties might need to be developed, or access would need to be retained in order to provide water services for the region. If those areas were “prohibit” only, then it would also prohibit those types of activities. Therefore, they wanted to provide something more than the “strictly limit” standard that might apply to privately owned property. It would be a greater level of protection but not “prohibit” for fear of prohibiting some sort of public need project in the future.

Chris Deffebach continued to review the MTAC comments.

Deanna Mueller-Crispin asked if the medium employment value or medium land value were all included in the medium category.

Chris Deffebach said that most of the land that was in the medium urban development value was there because of its design type, not because of its employment density or the land value. The most encompassing of those ways to become a medium urban development value was the design type. She continued to review the comments.

Rob Drake asked if the Tualatin Basin recommended “lightly limit” in impact areas. He wanted to know if Tualatin Basin was proposing something more restrictive than MTAC.

Chris Deffebach said yes, although they had not defined what “lightly limit” would mean in an impact area. She said that about 16,000 impact areas had no resource value right now (no trees left, and/or they were paved). The issue was about the trade-offs between the additional regulatory efforts that would be required in these areas versus the gain of restoring the habitat area because there was no resource value left.

Andy Cotugno referred to page 2 of the transmittal memorandum, which was included in the packet and forms part of the record, and to the series of five (5) recommendations on that page. He said that of those five recommendations, MTAC was probably most split on that issue of increasing protection in impact areas. The sense of the group was that the types of treatments they should be doing in that area mostly dealt with storm-water throughout the basin. They should be pursuing storm-water treatment throughout the basin and not just in the adjacent areas that were designated impact areas.

Rob Drake said it might be helpful to get an explanation from MTAC on the pro/con for this issue.

Chris Deffebach said that the pro was that it was an opportunity, as those areas were redeveloped and they become subject to new regulatory requirements, to help restore areas that would otherwise not be restored. The debate was over what was the best way to encourage that restoration; was it through a non-regulatory approach such as education, or through a regulatory approach?

Rob Drake asked if the “allow” versus “lightly limit” approach had any linkage with Title 3 and those restrictions.

Andy Cotugno said that all the areas were outside of Title 3.

Sue Marshall, Tualatin Riverkeepers, MTAC, Goal 5 TAC, WRPAC, and the Tualatin Basin Steering Committee, said that one thing that was not tested in the study was the possibility of an educational program for those impact areas. The Goal 5 TAC, knowing that the current in those areas would impact the resource, were looking at the possibility of voluntary, educational, and even a regulatory component for the next phase related to storm-water treatment. In the Tualatin Basin, they were also looking at design element, and educational programs that applied to impact areas. From a watershed protection perspective, the Tualatin Basin approach had an additional category that provided the “allow” for outer impact areas.

Doug Neeley said that a lot of redevelopable land, at least in his jurisdiction, was within the flood plain. He said it was a mitigation benefit in terms of cut and fill policies that applied to Title 3. He said that the Tualatin Basin approach was going in an appropriate direction, particularly in those areas that were redevelopment areas.

Andy Cotugno said that all floodplains, both developed and undeveloped, were in the resource category, not in the impact area category.

Chris Deffebach continued review of the MTAC comments.

Doug Neeley asked for clarification on what kind of restrictions currently applied outside the classifications they had in the document regarding floodplains, unmapped steeped slopes, and the riparian wildlife. He wanted to know if staff had recommended special designations for those three, apart from what was on the table.

Chris Deffebach said that staff had not changed the recommendation from when it first went out pertaining to the “lightly limit” designation proposed for the Class 2 riparian.

Carl Hosticka said he thought the question was did staff differentiate between undeveloped floodplains and other types of habitat areas.

Chris Deffebach said no they were not included together. The Class 2 classification was developed via a point system.

Doug Neeley said that the staff recommendation was to “moderately limit.”

Chris Deffebach said it was “lightly limit” for high or medium in Class 2, “moderately limit” in low and other.

Kent Hutchinson asked Chris Deffebach to define “parks.”

Chris Deffebach said that “parks” were privately or publicly owned land such as some privately owned golf courses and open spaces.

Kent Hutchinson asked if neighborhood parks would fall under protection.

Chris Deffebach said that if the park had fish and/or wildlife resources then it would fall under protection, not all parks, however, had habitat resources, as they were too small or too developed.

Nick Wilson wanted to talk about offsite transfer development rights. MTAC was recommending that MPAC not pursue that issue. They cited practical concerns for this decision. He was concerned about this and asked Chris Deffebach to speak to the issue.

Chris Deffebach said that on the second attachment from MTAC, in addition to the regulatory items, they laid out recommendations for developing the program. There was discussion on whether they should jump to that topic or continue the review of comments from MTAC.

Doug Neeley said that this seemed like program directions and he wanted to know if they would be coming back to MPAC in the future.

Chris Deffebach said yes. She continued review of materials in the packet (attachment 2).

Gene Grant asked if someone from MTAC could explain their reservations about transferable development rights. He also asked for clarification on a possible conflict between that recommendation, Exhibit C which said that issue should be studied, and a footnote on the revised sheet just handed out (footnote 5 on yellow sheet) that said transferable development rights could be the solution to the

problem. It appeared that one indicated it would not even be considered, another wanted it to be studied, and the third said it is the solution to the problem.

Andy Cotugno said that there was the staff recommendation, which was the draft resolution in front of them that recommended they study it. Whereas the Goal 5 TAC agreed that that was part of the solution and MTAC disagreed. Therefore, there were three opinions from three groups.

Doug McClain said that most of the local governments had a lot of experience using transfer development rights onsite; many programs were based on that. He said that they thought there was very little opportunity to use transferable development rights offsite where they protected the resource, or to use the density that was somehow lost, and to create a bank to transfer somewhere else. He said that there were a myriad of problems with how it would work. They did not know where the receiver sites for the density would be located, so if they had a resource site in Forest Grove, for example, that they wanted to protect, and 50 units of excess density as a result, where and how would that be transferred? There were no receiving sites, but plenty of maximum density sites elsewhere.

Gene Grant asked if the opposition was just to the offsite locations.

Doug McClain said yes – just the offsite. They were okay with the onsite locations.

Gene Grant asked if that was just based on existing lot lines and parcelization. Offsite meant that they were ignoring the lot lines and clustering the development into a larger area in the same exact way that they would for onsite based on arbitrary parcel lot.

Doug McClain said it would be different in those cases where someone came in and aggregated those ownerships.

Gene Grant asked why they couldn't aggregate at the planning level. Parcel owner A could sell those density rights to parcel owner B in the same zone and cluster that density in that area. They would have the same density originally planned for, the same amount of transportation planned for, they would just move it from the resource to the non-resource area.

Doug McClain said that if a neighbor joined in on the application, they would not need it to be that complicated. He said that they would be able to do that as part of the development.

Nick Wilson asked about transfer of boundary expansion rights. He said they were taking land out of the developable pool and they would have to expand the boundary anyway. Why not give those property owners who lose density the right to team up with an owner outside the boundary and designate an area, which they could sell to the highest bidder? He said it would be an area that was slated for expansion, it would have value, and rather than come up with money to purchase those properties, compensate them instead.

Chris Deffebach said they had heard a lot of interest in transfer development rights, which was why it was in the staff recommendation.

Tom Hughes asked if they created the concept of saleable transferable development rights did they then create a property right within that transfer that allowed for a density increase regardless of what the local jurisdiction said?

Erik Sten said that they could kind of assume from the document that all land in high impact areas was likely to be developed. He said that the goal at the end of this work was to improve habitat, not just to hang onto what was out there. He said that the only way to do that was to get money for improved habitat out of development.

Judie Hammerstad asked about local implementations. She said that many of the jurisdictions were wrestling with the map because it was not correct. She said that the importance of the local implementation was not only the correction of the inventory maps, but also the input from the local jurisdictions on the program. If Metro wanted to have an effective program they would have to have an extensive amount of cooperation from the local jurisdictions. She said that she hoped there was a piece in the document that included local implementation input. She said that they would like to have the ability to meet the standard with the work that they had already done.

Chris Deffebach asked her if what they wanted was flexibility to tailor to what had already been done. She said that part of the recommendation was to work out something that was both general enough and complex enough to give people guidance. She continued review of the MTAC comments.

Doug Neeley spoke about mitigation. He thought mitigation was a good tool in general although it could be costly. He said that there were a lot of mitigation potentials within public land and if a developer were to come in, they could direct mitigation efforts to those riparian corridors that would be less impacted. He said they could seek mitigation from someplace that was not within the same watershed in which the development was occurring. He said that would be a positive move.

Chris Deffebach continued her review of the MTAC comments.

Chair Becker said that staff was asking MPAC to make a decision on acceptance or modification on the resolution and comments from MTAC.

Andy Cotugno said that the overall recommendation from MTAC was to support the resolution subject to changes and comments that they submitted. They were looking at the resolution as it was presented in the packet.

Rob Drake said he was supportive of not developing the floodplains, but he was concerned that in some cases they could make that land available to developers. He said it would come close to a taking in some cases. He said that he had advocated for the Tualatin Basin group to look at some sort of credit system or payment system for purchasing that type of land.

Motion:	Rob Drake, Mayor of Beaverton, with a second from Nick Wilson, City of Tigard, moved to have the resolution include asking Metro to review either a tax credit or credit of some kind and potential purchase of floodplain land that could otherwise be legally developed.
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Susan McLain said that it sounded a lot like a list that was under non-regulatory type ideas. She wanted to know if they wanted to highlight only the floodplains or did they want to include other non-regulatory items?

Rob Drake said his intent was not to limit it. He said that if they were taking someone's land and if they offered an alternative, it would probably go a lot further to helping them accomplish their goals.

Judie Hammerstad said there was a larger issue than just the floodplains. In the previous iteration of the resolution she said that “moderately limit” was equal to 60% and “strictly limit” was equal to 85%, which did violate the takings problem. They couldn’t really take more than 50%. She said that this issue could be the crux of whether this would be successful or not, and if they were not careful about this issue it would be fodder for an election campaign. There were places where they would like to “strictly limit” or even “prohibit” development, but they couldn’t take someone’s rights away without compensation.

Chris Deffebach said that in the current resolution under Exhibit D, direction on non-regulatory programs, one of the programs was willing-seller acquisitions, there was a recommendation to pursue purchase of land that provided habitat function such as floodplains. It was mentioned in the resolution, but what they were proposing was a little stronger.

Gene Grant said that in his view, what the direction to Council should be was that to the extent that they could allow no loss of development rights through transfers, then they did not have to worry about buying development rights. But to the extent that they couldn’t hold them harmless through some transfer program, if Metro took their development rights, in part, under this program, then Metro should be prepared to pay for it either with money or through an exchange program.

Chris Deffebach re-read the motion for the committee as: To have the resolution include asking Metro to review either a tax credit or credit of some kind and/or potential purchase of floodplain land that could otherwise be legally developed thereby compensating for reduction of development rights.

Andy Cotugno said that they were not acting on the overall resolution, but rather adding to comments that MTAC had already made. They still needed to decide what their overall motion would be pertaining to the resolution.

Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.
-------	--------------------------------

Motion:	Doug Neeley, City of Oregon City, with a second from Nathalie Darcy, Citizen of Washington County, moved to accept MTAC’s recommendation to include a “strictly limit plus” category on parks and rural areas, specifically those areas that were essentially natural areas.
---------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Nick Wilson added that this would be based on the map – after map corrections had been made. He said that the jurisdictions all had trail plans that were not built yet because, in many cases, the trail went through wetlands. It would be expensive to put up boardwalks, but he said that he would like to see development of parks/trails in wetlands as a possibility.

Carl Hosticka said that part of that would be addressed by what they meant by “strictly limit plus.” In a discussion at WRPAC it was said that ultimately they would look at the functions available in an area. If they perceived that they were degrading the functions overall, then they would take actions to avoid that activity. Consideration of activities would be done in a way that would improve the quality of the site.

Tom Hughes said that the advantage of what MTAC had recommended was that it was logical that there would be some parklands that would have a “prohibit” designation. The problem was that if “prohibit” meant complete restriction, then in terms of maintenance, there would be a serious problem as it introduced a liability. The idea of “strictly limit” did, however, help them protect parklands that they did not want to ever develop.



Motion:	Doug Neeley, City of Oregon City, with a second from Nick Wilson, City of Tigard, moved to accept MTAC's recommendation to include a "strictly limit plus" category on parks and rural areas, specifically those areas that were essentially natural areas.
---------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.
-------	--------------------------------

Motion:	Tom Hughes, Mayor of Hillsboro, with a second from Gene Grant, Mayor of Happy Valley, moved to modify the resolution to include MTAC's recommendation on Class 1 and Class A riparian wildlife to move from the "medium limit" urban values to a "strictly limit" category.
---------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Tom Hughes said that when they originally started with the RSIA all of the high value industrial lands were in an RSIA category. That concept got warped into something different during the course of the process and now the designation no longer reflected value but rather simply reflected a designation.

Doug Neeley said that, looking at the table, the Class A upland wildlife would be taken from a "moderately limit" to a "lightly limit," which concerned him a great deal. It would also affect the Class 1 riparian wildlife areas. Therefore the two highest classes for riparian and upland wildlife were essentially shifted into "lightly limit" which he felt was not acceptable.

Nathalie Darcy said that MTAC recommended that they would only provide strict limits on those properties that had a low urban development value. That essentially was the same as saying that economic factors would trump the environment factors. She expressed concern that that would not get them back to their objectives through Goal 5 to repair, protect, and restore a continuous ecologically viable streamside corridor system.

Erik Sten said he could not support shifting Class A land to a lower protection level. He said that he did, however, agree with the intent behind the MTAC recommendation to make some industrial land re-developable.

Tim Crail said that to the extent that there were Class 1 and Class A areas in the town centers and other areas that were currently at a medium development value, and that those were the most important areas to protect, he had to agree with Erik Sten. In areas that were highly developed, or slated to be highly developed, those values already in existence needed to be preserved in order to create a corridor where fish and wildlife habitat may be protected or allowed to increase. He said that those areas needed more protection, not less protection.

Tom Hughes said that the issue was not to diminish the Class A wildlife. They had already said that high value land deserved "lightly limit" classification. The issue that was raised by MTAC was that in some jurisdictions land identified by class was in fact high urban development value land. He said that they should apply protection based on the value of the land and not on the designation of where it was located.

Erik Sten said that changing the level of protection seemed the wrong response to that issue.

Tom Hughes said that much of the value of the land in the region was in those categories so it was not that Hillsboro's industrial section should be reclassified as RSIA's, or a regional center, or central city, it was that it was not in any of those categories, but was valuable land.

Gene Grant asked for clarification on the motion. He thought the motion was to move those town centers, and main streets into the high urban category, but not to adopt MTAC recommendation for the medium urban.

Chris Deffebach said that it would essentially eliminate the medium category, they would all move to the high designation.

Motion:	Chris Deffebach read the components of the motion which was to move the medium urban development values and include those design types into the high category, which would change the protection in the Class 1 riparian and the Class A wildlife from “moderately limit” to “lightly limit” and the former from “strictly limit” to “moderately limit.”
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Vote:	The motion failed with a vote of six (6) yeas, ten (10) nays, and two (2) abstentions. (Two members arrived late and missed this vote).
-------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Motion:	John Hartsock, Clackamas County Special Districts, with a second from Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen, moved to recommend Resolution 04-3440 as in the packet with the revised attachment as was qualified by MPAC.
---------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Amendment to motion:	Gene Grant, Mayor of Happy Valley, with a second from Ed Gronke, Citizen of Clackamas County, proposed an amendment to modify the “strictly limit” and “moderately limit” portion of Exhibit C to say “any loss of development rights should be compensated by either a transfer of development rights or other form of compensation.”
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Motion:	Tim Crail, Multnomah County Citizen, with a second from Doug Neeley, City of Oregon City, moved to delete the part of the amendment which says “any loss of development rights should be compensated by transfer development rights or some other form of compensation.”
---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Doug Neeley said that his concern was defining what would constitute a loss of development.

Judie Hammerstad said that they had resource protection zones in Lake Oswego. They had a development application, which they approved but only to be able to develop 50% because that was allowed without getting into a taking. With the motion before them, they would have to pay for that and they did not want to get into a situation where they had to pay for everything.

John Hartsock said that it said “to work to minimize loss of development capacity, consider development of the TDR program or other form of compensation to compensate for the loss.” That explains how to set the program up, but not the program. He cautioned them that with Initiative 36 they should be mindful.

Carl Hosticka asked Gene Grant if he meant that they should study it, or was he trying to give direction about what the program should be?

Gene Grant said that he was not trying to define the program, but rather that the degree of compensation should be determined. They should strive to avoid taking development rights without compensation.

Vote:	The motion to delete the part of the amendment, which says “any loss of development rights should be compensated by transfer development rights or some other form of
-------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	compensation” passed with a vote of eleven (11) yeas, four (4) nays, and five (5) abstentions.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Motion:	John Hartsock, Special Districts Clackamas County, with a second from Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen, moved to recommend Resolution 04-3440 with a revised attachment 1 as amended by the previous motions, and revising “strictly limit” and “moderately limit” in Exhibit C, under the last sentence where it says “consider development of the transfer development program or other forms of compensation.”
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Erik Sten said that he would like to amend the motion to emphasize that the work includes existing local Goal 5 programs baseline analysis. This was for two reasons: 1) they did not want to confuse the citizens and 2) they did not want to overstate the amount of developable land that was lost.

Andy Cotugno said the baseline alternative that all the alternatives were compared against did not include all of the local Goal 5 programs. It included a standardized Title 3 program across the region. However, the report and the analysis acknowledged that local programs go farther than that baseline program. If the motion was to literally go back and revise that baseline program to map and reflect all the local programs and then publish a revised ESEE analysis to account for the six alternatives as they compared to that baseline program, that would add a significant amount of work and time to the program. If, on the other hand, the motion was to acknowledge that there were other programs out there that go farther than the baseline that was in the document, then that could be readily accommodated.

Amendment to motion:	Erik Sten, City of Portland, with a second from Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen, proposed an amendment to the motion to ensure that the program that was developed recognized the existing Goal 5 program could go beyond the baseline that was incorporated in the Metro ESEE analysis.
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Vote:	The amendment passed unanimously.
-------	-----------------------------------

Motion:	John Hartsock, Special Districts Clackamas County, with a second from Ed Gronke, Clackamas County Citizen, moved to recommend Resolution 04-3440 with a revised attachment 1 to have the resolution include asking Metro to review either a tax credit or credit of some kind and/or potential purchase of floodplain land that could otherwise be legally developed thereby compensating for reduction of development rights, and revising “strictly limit” and “moderately limit” in Exhibit C to say “consider development of the transfer development program or other forms of compensation,” and including the amendment to ensure that the program that was developed recognized the existing Goal 5 program could go beyond the baseline that was incorporated in the Metro ESEE analysis.
---------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Chris Deffebach wanted to clarify that the amendment to Exhibit C that said to look at TDRs or other forms of compensation superseded what MTAC had said about not considering these.

Vote:	The motion passed unanimously.
-------	--------------------------------

**7. CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER RECOMMENDATION ORDINANCE 04-1040**

Andy Cotugno introduced the ordinance and reviewed where the ordinance had reached. He also reviewed the large map that was on display for the members.

Judie Hammerstad said that the two areas that they were interested in having deleted was the Borland area because of lack of productivity and Frog Pond. The Borland area was 575 acres that were recommended to come into the UGB with only 151 acres that would be industrial. That was less than 25%, so over 71% of those acres were non-industrial. The Frog Pond area was much more difficult to serve than it originally looked like in the Chief Operating Officer's original recommendation. They were not asking to have those acres taken out and have the need reduced. They were proposing instead that other acreage be substituted. She said that there had been a lot of cooperation between the local jurisdictions in identifying acres that were either within the UGB or that could come into the UGB, with the cooperation of the local jurisdictions who wanted to serve those areas and to include them. The two areas that she already mentioned, Frog Pond and Borland Road, did not have the support of local jurisdictions. Instead, they would like to propose the following substitutions: There would be 93 acres net in Oregon City that were recently annexed but not yet zoned, and they were shown on the comprehensive plan for industrial use. Wilsonville had 200 acres net that were also annexed to Wilsonville but not yet zoned, but were identified within the comprehensive plan for future industrial expansion. She recommended adding the Noyer Creek site in Clackamas County and it had 285-300 net acres of land. They were zoned EFU but were needed to provide sewer service to the Boring area to avoid multiple lift stations, and also would provide industrial acreage for job growth in Boring. The area also included two large parcels of 258 acres. The Quarry site (236 acres) was partially zoned EFU and the topsoil was already removed through aggregate operations, so it was therefore not farmable EFU land. Troutdale had 39 net acres that were identified by the City of Troutdale staff as additional industrial acreage near the Troutdale airport that was designated industrial in their comprehensive plan. This area was separate from the former Alcoa site that was still under debate. There was the Evergreen site, which the City of Hillsboro had identified in three increments of 256 acres, 172 acres, and 152 acres, which made up 1,524 acres that could be included in the recommendation. She said that they would recommend to the staff that they take a look at these particular acres that jurisdictions were willing to serve, and include this in the recommendation for the Metro Council instead of the Borland area and Frog Pond area.

Andy Cotugno said that these were a set of possible amendments to bring back to the next meeting of MPAC and assess them so that they could decide whether or not they wanted to consider them.

Doug Neeley said that it seemed appropriate to include those lands as industrial because they were already within the UGB and covered by jurisdiction's comprehensive plans. It would be no different than designations on lands that they would be pulling in as a result of a new expansion. They also had the same kind of designation as the land that was being considered.

Brian Newman said that the list Judie Hammerstad had read from sounded like a mix of areas that were inside the boundary but for whatever reason didn't get counted correctly, and others that were outside the boundary but weren't in the study areas.

Judie Hammerstad said that they weren't in the recommendation but the local jurisdiction's were interested in including those lands. It seemed reasonable to have staff take a look at the proposal to see if it would be an appropriate to include.

Andy Cotugno said that if they were to adopt what she was suggesting then there would be some areas coming out and other areas going in and that expressed recognition of some industrial capacity.

Judie Hammerstad agreed and added that some of the suggested areas already had infrastructure in place to serve.

Martha Schrader said she thought it was reasonable proposal.

Tom Hughes agreed with the comments on the Evergreen site. They did, however, have some qualms about moving Waible Creek. He asked if Jim Jacks could present for the City of Tualatin and their resolutions pertaining to this issue.

The committee allowed for him to speak.

Jim Jacks, City of Tualatin, reviewed the resolutions, which are attached and provide part of the record.

Carl Hosticka said that in the Tualatin area, between Tualatin and Wilsonville, there had been extensive discussion about bifurcating that area and taking in half of it, or designating the portions to the north next to Tualatin as residential. He wondered if they had come to any conclusion yet, or did they simply say that they did not want any of it?

Jim Jacks said that issue came up in terms of location for the I-5 and 99W connector. That connector could potentially go in to the Tualatin area between the two cities. Until they knew where the corridor for the connector might go, they would like to leave that area out. They were studying several alternatives to identify 3-4 corridors and then they could work on determining which location would be best for the connector.

Judie Hammerstad asked the MPAC committee members to identify if there was a consensus as to where they were heading.

There was general agreement that they were heading in the right direction.

Chair Becker said that decision would be made at the next meeting. He asked if they wanted any response from MTAC on this proposal.

Members said no.

There being no further business, Chair Becker adjourned the meeting at 7:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes  
MPAC Coordinator

ATTACHMENTS TO THE RECORD FOR MAY 12, 2004

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

**DOCUMENT**

---

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>
<b>#6 Goal 5 Resolution</b>	May 2004	Revised Attachment 1, Comparison of staff recommended Modified Option 2B with Goal 5TAC/WRPAC and MTAC recommendations (yellow)	051204-MPAC-01
<b>#6 Goal 5 Resolution</b>	May 12, 2004	Attachment 2. Key issues for Council consideration and responses. (green)	051204-MPAC-02
<b>#6 Goal 5 Resolution</b>	May 7, 2004	Memo from Mike Houck to MPAC and Metro Council re: Goal 5 Process and MTAC ESEE Recommendations, Ribbons of Green or Scraps of Green?	051204-MPAC-03
<b>#6 Goal 5 Resolution</b>	May 11, 2004	Email from John Frewing to MPAC members re: Irreversible Action in Not Maximizing Protection of Undeveloped Floodplains	051204-MPAC-04
<b>#6 Goal 5 Resolution</b>	May 11, 2004	Email from Jim Labbe to Becky Tate re: MPAC Meeting	051204-MPAC-05
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 5, 2004	Letter from Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland to David Bragdon re: Proposed Ordinance 04-1040, Industrial UGB Expansion	051204-MPAC-06
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	April 29, 2004	Memo to MPAC from Dave Volz re: testimony regarding the UGB expansion	051204-MPAC-07
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 10, 2004	Testimony to MPAC regarding Inclusion of Oregon City Golf Club North Parcel in the Metro UGB by Rose Holden	051204-MPAC-08
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 12, 2004	Email from Jim Jacks to MPAC regarding UGB Agenda Item – including Tualatin resolutions and supporting maps	051204-MPAC-09
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 2004	Maps of sites included in the UGB expansion study	051204-MPAC-10
<b>#7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 2004	Chief Operating Officer's Recommended Areas map, Ordinance 04-1040	051204-MPAC-11
<b>#5 Council Update &amp; #7 COO Recommendation Ordinance 04-1040</b>	May 11, 2004	Industrial Land Decision Process Includes Title IV and UGB Expansion Proposed Schedule	051204-MPAC-12

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE ) ORDINANCE NO. 04-1045  
2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN )  
("RTP") FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE )  
2004 INTERIM FEDERAL RTP AND ) Introduced by Councilor Rod Park  
STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS )

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved the 2000 RTP by Ordinance No. 00-869A (For the Purpose of Adopting the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan) on August 10, 2000 as the regional "Transportation System Plan" ("TSP") required by state Goal 12 through the statewide planning Goal 12 through the state Transportation Planning Rule ("TPR"); and

WHEREAS, a key purpose of the regional TSP is to define a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet transportation needs and support planned land uses set forth in the 2040 Growth Concept, consistent with the requirements of other statewide planning goals; and

WHEREAS, the Land Conservation and Development Commission approved and acknowledged the 2000 RTP and 2020 Priority System on July 9, 2001, as the regional TSP for the Portland metropolitan region until the next RTP update; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council directed that the 2004 update to the RTP be narrowed in scope to only address federal planning requirements and approved the 2004 Interim Federal RTP by Resolution No. 03-3380A (For the Purpose of Adopting the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to Meet Federal Planning Requirements) on December 11, 2003; and

WHEREAS, as a follow-up to the 2004 update, Exhibit "A" identifies consistency amendments to the 2000 RTP to address statewide planning goals and implement the 2004 Interim Federal RTP in anticipation of a major review of RTP policies and projects to be completed by 2007; and

WHEREAS, no major changes to policies and projects are proposed in Exhibit “A”; and

WHEREAS, cities and counties in the region have made amendments to their transportation systems plans in order to comply with Metro’s 2000 RTP, and these TSP amendments have generated proposed amendments to the functional system maps in the RTP, new transportation projects and studies and changes in the location, description, cost or timing of previously approved projects; and

WHEREAS, Metro and cities and counties of the region have completed corridor studies and comprehensive planning pursuant to Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, since adoption of the 2000 RTP, and these plans have generated proposed technical amendments to Chapter 6 (Implementation) of the RTP; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has received and considered the advice of its Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and its Metro Policy Advisory Committee, and all proposed amendments identified in Exhibit “A” have been the subject of a 45-day public review period; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council held public hearings on amendments to the 2000 RTP identified in Exhibit “A” on May 13 and July 8, 2004; now, therefore

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Text and maps in Chapter 2 (Transportation) of the Regional Framework Plan (“RFP”), and Chapter 1 (Regional Transportation Policy) and Chapter 3 (Growth and the Preferred System) of the 2000 RTP are hereby amended as set forth in Part 1 (Policy Amendments) of Exhibit “A”, attached and incorporated into this ordinance.
2. Text and maps in Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP are hereby amended as set forth in Part 2 (Project Amendments) of Exhibit “A” to identify the scope and nature of the proposed transportation improvements that address the 20-year needs.
3. Text in Chapter 6 (Implementation) of the 2000 RTP is hereby amended as set forth in Part 3 (Technical Amendments) of Exhibit “A” to demonstrate regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements and establish regional TSP and functional requirements for city and county comprehensive plans and local TSPs.
4. Metro’s 2000 RTP and these amendments to it, together with Titles 2 and 10 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, comprise Metro’s 2000 RTP, adopted as the regional functional plan for transportation under ORS 268.390, and the regional transportation system plan required by state planning law.



5. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Exhibit "C", attached and incorporated into this ordinance, explain how these amendments to the RTP comply with state transportation and land use planning laws and the RFP.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_ day of July, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

ATTEST:

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christina Billington, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 04-1045 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2000 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE 2004 INTERIM FEDERAL RTP AND STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS

---

Date: April 13, 2004

Prepared by: Kim Ellis

#### PROPOSED ACTION

This ordinance would adopt amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the regional transportation system plan (TSP) and the regional functional plan for transportation, as required by ORS 268.390, and establish consistency with the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and interim 2004 Federal RTP. No major changes to policies or projects are proposed. The proposed amendments focus on incorporating new transportation projects, and policy and technical updates that were approved in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP on Dec. 11, 2003. Metro is not required to update the regional transportation plan for state planning purposes until 2007.

The amendments to the 2000 RTP, included as Exhibit "A" are organized as follows:

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

The Policy Packet includes functional map amendments to various modal system maps and policy text changes to Chapter 1 of the 2000 RTP to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding. The amendments reflect changes recommended in local transportation plans adopted since 2000 that were endorsed by Metro as "friendly amendments" as part of the local review process, and policy discussions during the 2004 Interim Federal Update to the RTP.

- Project Packet (Exhibit A, Part 2) - Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP includes a description of the priority system, which is intended to satisfy the state TPR requirements for an "adequate" system, as well as procedures and criteria in Chapter 6 for amending the projects. As the federally recognized system, the 2004 RTP financially constrained system is the source of transportation projects that are currently eligible for state and federal funding. New transportation projects amended into local plans since adoption of the 2000 RTP and that were included in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP financially constrained system would need to be amended into the 2000 RTP priority system in order to advance to project development planning and construction prior to 2007, when the next RTP update is required.

The Project Packet identifies a list of projects recommended for amendment into Chapter 5 of the 2000 RTP, which defines the 2020 RTP Priority System. The packet was limited to new projects recommended in local transportation plans or corridor studies adopted since 2000 and endorsed by Metro as "friendly amendments" as part of the local review process and that were included in the updated financially constrained system as part of the 2004 Federal Update. The amendments include project recommendations from the I-5 Trade Corridor Partnership Study, Powell/Foster Corridor Study (Phase 1), Pleasant Valley Concept Plan, Powell Boulevard Streetscape Study and the McLoughlin Boulevard Enhancement Plan. Projects that require goal exceptions findings have not be

recommended for inclusion in these amendments. Local jurisdictions will address their local land use regulations through the land use permitting process that will occur during the final design and construction phases of a particular project.

- Technical Packet (Exhibit A, Part 3) - Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP establishes regional compliance with state and federal planning requirements, and sets requirements for city and county compliance with the RTP. This chapter also identifies future studies needed to refine the RTP as part of future updates. These future studies are consistent with state TPR provisions that require refinement planning in areas where a transportation need exists, but further analysis is required to define specific solutions. Since the 2000 RTP update, a number of corridor studies and concept plans for new urban areas have been completed, and approved by local or regional officials, or are about to be completed.

The Technical Packet incorporates several technical changes to Chapter 6 of the 2000 RTP that delete technical requirements that have been addressed through recently adopted corridor studies and frame future work that must still be completed as part of future updates to the RTP. The changes reflected in the technical amendments include recommendations from the following planning efforts: Powell-Foster Corridor study (Phase I), I-5 South – Wilsonville Area study and Regional Travel Option strategic planning.

## BACKGROUND

The most pressing need for amendments to the 2000 RTP is to establish regional consistency with statewide planning goals for policies and projects adopted in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP to allow projects to advance toward project development and possibly construction during the period in which separate state and federal RTP documents exist.

On December 11, 2003, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council approved the 2004 Interim Federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by Resolution No. 03-3380A. The 2004 RTP update was narrowed to include only those amendments needed to address federal planning regulations and ensure continued certification by federal agencies. As a result, the 2004 update focused on updating the 2000 RTP financially constrained system. Amendments to the plan that address state planning goals and Transportation Planning Rule requirements were deferred to the next scheduled update, due for completion in 2007.

As a result, Metro now has two, regional transportation plans in place that serve separate purposes:

- **2000 RTP meets state planning requirements and serves as the basis for land use decisions in the region**

In 1991, the Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR implements State Land Use Planning Goal 12, Transportation, which was adopted by the Oregon Legislature in 1974. The TPR requires most cities and counties and the state's four MPOs (including Metro) to adopt transportation system plans that consider all modes of transportation, energy conservation and avoid principal reliance on any one mode to meet transportation needs. By state law, local plans in MPO areas must be consistent with the regional transportation system plan (TSP).

In the Portland region, the existing 2000 RTP and 2020 priority system serves as the regional Transportation System Plan (TSP) that meets state planning requirements, as required by the Transportation Planning Rule. As the regional TSP, the 2000 RTP serves as the regional strategy for addressing transportation needs, integrating land use and transportation to implement the 2040

Growth Concept, and determining whether regional transportation projects are consistent with state planning goals until the next RTP update. Metro is not required to update the regional TSP until 2007.

- **2004 Interim Federal RTP meets federal planning requirements**

The 2004 Interim Federal RTP and 2025 financially constrained system is the “federally recognized” transportation plan that meets federal planning requirements. Projects that are included in the 2025 Financially Constrained System are eligible to receive state and federal funds and have been demonstrated to conform with the Clean Air Act. Metro is not required to update the federal plan until 2007.

Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document.

### **Public Comment Opportunities**

A public comment period was held on the proposed policy, project and technical amendments was held from April 15 to June 1, 2004. Because this update of the RTP constitutes a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period was on the staff recommended changes to the plan as identified in the public review document, not the overall RTP document. The proposed amendments were consolidated into a single public review document that was available for review on Metro's website. The Metro Council held a public hearing on May 13, 2004 on Exhibit “A.”

The Metro Council is being asked to approve Exhibits “A,” and “B” and direct this Ordinance, and Exhibits “A,” and “B” upon its adoption by the Metro Council be submitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development pursuant to the post-acknowledgement process at ORS 197.610..

### ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

#### **1. Known Opposition**

None known.

#### **2. Legal Antecedents**

Previous related Metro Council actions include:

- Metro Ordinance No. 00-869A, adopting the 2000 RTP as the regional transportation system plan for the Portland metropolitan region.
- Metro Resolution No. 02-3186A, amending the 2000 RTP and 2002 MTIP to incorporate OTIA bond projects.
- Metro Ordinance No. 02-946A, amending the 2000 RTP to incorporate post-acknowledgement amendments to the 2000 RTP.
- Metro Ordinance 03-1007A, amending the 2000 RTP to incorporate the two phases of the South Corridor Study.
- Metro Resolution 03-3351, amending the 2000 RTP and MTIP to incorporate the South Corridor LRT Project recommendations.
- Metro Resolution 04-3080A, approving the 2004 Federal Update to the Regional Transportation Plan as the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Plan to meet federal planning requirements.

#### **3. Anticipated Effects**

Approval of this Ordinance completes an interim update to the 2000 RTP to meet federal planning requirements and allows projects in the updated 2004 RTP financially constrained system to be funded and allowed to proceed to project development, and possibly construction, during the development of the 2007 RTP. Projects, in particular, need to be included in both documents in order to receive federal and state funding and move forward to construction during the period when separate state and federal transportation plans are in place. Several projects are under consideration for federal earmarks and state funding through the Oregon Transportation Investment Act III.

The Council is considering a budget proposal to postpone the next scheduled update to the RTP to allow more staff resources to be devoted to the 2040 Re-evaluation. This proposal would defer the bulk of the next RTP update to 2006-07, which would still meet state and federal planning requirements. In the interim, Metro will likely be asked amend the RTP, as necessary, to incorporate projects resulting from corridor studies or other transportation planning efforts.

If this proposal is approved, staff recommends that an explanatory handout be provided for the general public in the short term, since a Fall 2004 start to the next RTP update has been widely discussed.

**4. Budget Impact**

None.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Adopt Ordinance 04-1045.

# Public Review Draft

## ***2000 Regional Transportation Plan Amendments***

**No major changes to policies or  
projects are proposed.**

*April 15, 2004*



**METRO**

PEOPLE PLACES  
OPEN SPACES

## **Metro**

### **People places • open spaces**

Metro serves 1.3 million people who live in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and the 24 cities in the Portland metropolitan area. The regional government provides transportation and land-use planning services and oversees regional garbage disposal and recycling and waste reduction programs.

Metro manages regional parks and greenspaces and owns the Oregon Zoo. It also oversees operation of the Oregon Convention Center, the Portland Center for the Performing Arts and the Portland Metropolitan Exposition (Expo) Center, all managed by the Metropolitan Exposition Recreation Commission.

### **Your Metro representatives**

Metro Council President – David Bragdon

Metro Councilors – Rod Park, District 1; Brian Newman, District 2; Carl Hosticka, District 3; Susan McLain, District 4; Rex Burkholder, District 5; Rod Monroe, District 6.

Auditor – Alexis Dow, CPA

Metro's web site: [www.metro-region.org](http://www.metro-region.org)

Metro  
600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736  
(503) 797-1700

Printed on 100 percent recycled paper,  
30 percent post-consumer fiber

# 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Amendments

Thank you for taking the time to review proposed amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The amendments are a follow-up to approval of the 2004 Interim Federal RTP, and establish consistency between the existing 2000 RTP with the new federal plan. **No major changes to policies or projects are proposed.**

## Background

On December 11, 2003, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation and the Metro Council approved the 2004 Interim Federal RTP by Resolution No. 03-3380A. Originally intended to update the region's transportation plan to meet both state and federal planning regulations, the 2004 update was narrowed to include only those amendments needed to address federal planning regulations.

As a result, Metro now has two, regional transportation plans in place that serve separate purposes:

- **2000 RTP meets state planning requirements**

In 1991, the Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR implements State Land Use Planning Goal 12, Transportation, which was adopted by the Oregon Legislature in 1974. The TPR requires most cities and counties and the state's four MPOs (including Metro) to adopt transportation system plans that consider all modes of transportation, energy conservation and avoid principal reliance on any one mode to meet transportation needs. By state law, local plans in MPO areas must be consistent with the regional transportation system plan (TSP).

In the Portland region, the existing 2000 RTP and 2020 priority system serves as the regional TSP that meets state planning requirements. As the regional TSP, the 2000 RTP will continue to serve as the basis for determining whether regional transportation projects are consistent with state planning goals. Metro is not required to update the regional TSP until 2007.

- **2004 Interim Federal RTP meets federal planning requirements**

The 2004 Interim Federal RTP and 2025 financially constrained system is the "federally recognized" transportation plan that meets federal planning requirements. Projects that are included in the 2025 Financially Constrained System are eligible to receive state and federal funds and have been demonstrated to conform with the Clean Air Act. Metro is not required to update the federal plan until 2007.

Amendments to the 2000 RTP are needed now to reconcile the two plans and maintain consistency between the Federal and State plans.



## **Public Comment Opportunities**

The public comment period begins on Thursday, April 15 and ends at noon on Tuesday, June 1, 2004. Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document. The proposed amendments to the 2000 RTP are organized into a public review document that is organized as follows:

- Part 1 - policy amendments
- Part 2 - project amendments
- Part 3 - technical amendments

The public review document will be available for review on Metro's web site (<http://www.metro-region.org/rtp>), and as a printed document as part of the 45-day public comment period.

You may submit comments in the following ways:

- on-line from Metro's website: **[www.metro-region.org/rtp](http://www.metro-region.org/rtp)**
- e-mail to [trans@metro-region.org](mailto:trans@metro-region.org)
- mail to Metro, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232 (attention: Kim Ellis)
- fax to (503) 797-1911
- leave a message on Metro's Transportation hotline at (503) 797-1900, Option 2.
- testify at a Metro Council public hearing on May 13, 2004.

## **For more information**

For more information, call Regional Transportation Planning at (503) 797-1839, or send e-mail to [trans@metro-region.org](mailto:trans@metro-region.org). The hearing impaired can call (503) 797-1804.



# Part 1

## *2000 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Amendments*

*April 15, 2004*



**METRO**  
PEOPLE PLACES  
OPEN SPACES

# 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Amendments

Thank you for taking the time to review proposed amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The amendments are a follow-up to approval of the 2004 interim Federal RTP, and establish consistency between the existing 2000 RTP with the new federal plan. **No major changes to policies or projects are proposed.**

Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document.

## Summary of Policy Amendments

A number of local transportation system plans, corridor studies and concept plans for new urban areas have been completed, and approved by local and/or regional officials since the 2000 RTP was approved in August 2000. Policy recommendations from these studies were adopted in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP and are now recommended to be incorporated in the 2000 RTP.

The proposed policy amendments are:

- Amendments to Chapter 1 of the 2000 RTP are recommended for Figure 1.4 (Regional Street Design System Map), Figure 1.12 (Regional Motor Vehicle Functional Classification Map), Figure 1.16 (Regional Public Transportation System Map), Figure 1.17 (Regional Freight System Map), Figure 1.18 (Regional Bicycle System Map) and Figure 1.19 (Regional Pedestrian System Map). The specific amendments reflect fine-tuning of the various modal system maps based on local transportation updates.
- Amendments to maps in Chapter 3 of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan, Figure 3.2 (Regional Trails and Greenways), Figure 3.3 (Existing and Proposed Regional Bicycle System) and Figure 3.4 (Existing and Proposed Regional Pedestrian System) to incorporate the Policy Map Amendments identified for Figure 1.18 (Regional Bicycle System Map) and Figure 1.19 (Regional Pedestrian System Map).
- Policy text amendments to Chapter 1 to establish two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding.

The map amendments are listed in table form and the policy text amendments are shown in strikethrough/underscore.

## For more information

For more information, call Regional Transportation Planning at (503) 797-1839, or send e-mail to [trans@metro-region.org](mailto:trans@metro-region.org). The hearing impaired can call (503) 797-1804.

- Amend Figure 1.4 (Regional Street Design Classification Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.4  
Street Design Classification Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
Allen Boulevard	At Murray Boulevard intersection	“Possible boulevard intersection”	Delete “Possible boulevard intersection” designation	Beaverton Comprehensive Plan and Development Code
Hall Boulevard	Allen Boulevard to Denney Road	Regional boulevard	Delete “Regional boulevard” designation	Beaverton Comprehensive Plan and Development Code
Murray Boulevard	At Farmington Road intersection	“Possible boulevard intersection”	Delete “Possible boulevard intersection” designation	Beaverton Comprehensive Plan and Development Code
McLoughlin Boulevard (Highway 99E)	Gloucester Avenue to Arlington Street	Regional Boulevard	Regional Street	Gladstone Town center moved to Main Street
SE Railroad Avenue	SE 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Not classified	Community Street	Milwaukie TSP
Broadway Bridge		Community Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
E Burnside Street	108 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to 117 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Regional Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
E Burnside Street	127 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to 143rd Avenue	Regional Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
E Burnside Street	151 <sup>st</sup> Avenue to 162 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	Regional Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
Burnside Bridge		Community Boulevard	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
SW Capitol Highway	SW Galeburn to SW Luradel	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SW Capitol Highway	SW Brugger to SW Baird	Community Boulevard	Community Street	Portland TSP
SW Capitol Highway	SW Hume to SW Multnomah	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SW Capitol Highway	SW 31 <sup>st</sup> to SW 33rd	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP

**Figure 1.4  
Street Design Classification Map (continued)**

<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Current RTP classification</b>	<b>Proposed RTP classification</b>	<b>Source of change</b>
SE Clatsop Extension	SE Mt. Scott Boulevard to Deardorf / 132nd	Future Community Corridor	Remove from the RTP street design map or realign south of Willamette National Cemetery boundaries	Portland TSP
NE Cully Boulevard	NE 57 <sup>th</sup> to NE Prescott Street	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE Division Street	SE 129 <sup>th</sup> to SE 130 <sup>th</sup>	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE Division Street	SE 117 <sup>th</sup> to SE 122nd	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE Division Street	SE 82 <sup>nd</sup> to SE 89 <sup>th</sup>	Regional Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE Division Street	SE 75 <sup>th</sup> to SE 82 <sup>nd</sup>	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE Division Street	SE 33 <sup>rd</sup> to SE 50th	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
NE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	NE Sandy to NE Beech	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
NE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	NE Thompson to NE Halsey	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Mill Street to SE Clinton Street	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Raymond to SE Martins	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
Foster Road	SE 80 <sup>th</sup> to SE 82nd	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
Foster Road	SE Holgate to SE 75 <sup>th</sup>	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
Hawthorne Bridge		Regional Boulevard	Community Street	Portland TSP
St. Helens Road	NW Harbor through Linnton to north end of Kingsley park	Highway	Urban Road	Portland TSP
NE Killingsworth Street	NE 35 <sup>th</sup> PL to NE 30 <sup>th</sup>	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
NE/N Killingsworth Street	NE MLK to N Interstate	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
N Killingsworth Street	N Interstate to N Greeley	Not Classified	Community Street	Portland TSP
N Lombard Street	N Woolsey to N Philadelphia	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP

**Figure 1.4  
Street Design Classification Map (continued)**

<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Current RTP classification</b>	<b>Proposed RTP classification</b>	<b>Source of change</b>
N Lombard Street	N Interstate to N Seward	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
N Lombard Street	At Philadelphia Street	Boulevard intersection	Delete	STA coordination meeting
N Lombard Street	At Ida Street	Boulevard intersection	Delete	STA coordination meeting
Macadam Avenue (Highway 43)	Bancroft to Taylor's Ferry Road	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	STA coordination meeting
McLoughlin Boulevard	Grand/MLK Boulevard to SE Woodard (1 block north of Powell)	Highway	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
McLoughlin Boulevard	SE 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to Woodward St.	Highway	Urban Road	Portland TSP
Morrison Bridge		Community Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
SW Multnomah Boulevard	SW 30 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to SW 35 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 92 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Liebe to SE Harold Street	Regional Boulevard	Not classified	Portland TSP
SE 92 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Harold to SE Tolman Street	Regional Boulevard	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 92 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Tolman to SE Duke	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
NE 122 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	NE Multnomah to NE Oregon Street	Community Boulevard	Community Street	Portland TSP
SE 122 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Stark to SE Morrison Street	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 122 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	SE Clinton to SE Powell Boulevard	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE/NE Sandy Boulevard	SE 54 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to NE 47 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Community Boulevard	Regional Street	Portland TSP
NE Sandy Boulevard	NE 57 <sup>th</sup> to NE 82 <sup>nd</sup>	Regional Street	Regional Boulevard	Portland TSP
NE Sandy Boulevard	NE 122 <sup>nd</sup> to NE 163 <sup>rd</sup>	Urban Road	Regional Street	Portland TSP
Sellwood Bridge		Regional Street	Community Street	Portland TSP
SE 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	SE Linn to SE Tacoma	Unclassified	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
SE 17 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	SE Tacoma to SE Andover	Community Street	Community Boulevard	Portland TSP
Steel Bridge		Regional Boulevard	Community Street	Portland TSP
NE/SE 39 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	NE Broadway to SE Holgate	Community Street	Regional Street	Portland TSP

**Figure 1.4**  
**Street Design Classification Map (continued)**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
SE 39 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	SE Holgate to SE Woodstock	Unclassified	Community Street	Portland TSP
Macadam Avenue (Hwy 43)	In West Linn	Regional Boulevard	Regional Street	STA coordination meeting; West Linn to focus boulevard improvements on interior town center streets
Grant Street	Brookwood Parkway to 28th Avenue	No Designation	Community boulevard	Hillsboro TSP
Beef Bend Road		No Designation	Community street	Tigard TSP
Gaarde Street		No Designation	Community street	Tigard TSP
Walnut Street	Gaarde Street to Scholls Ferry Road	No Designation	Community street	Tigard TSP
95th Avenue	Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road	Not Classified	Urban Road	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Boeckman Road to Barber Street	No Road	Planned Urban Road	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Barber Street to Wilsonville Road	Not Classified	Urban Road	Wilsonville TSP
Boeckman Road	Railroad Tracks to 110th Avenue	No Road	Planned Community Street	Wilsonville TSP
Boeckman Road (old Tooze Road)	110th Avenue to Grahams Ferry Road	Not Classified	Community Street	Wilsonville TSP

- Amend Figure 1.12 (Regional Motor Vehicle System Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.12**  
**Motor Vehicle Functional Classification Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
Allen Boulevard	Hall Boulevard to Murray Boulevard	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Beaverton TSP
Hart Road	Murray Boulevard to 170 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Beaverton TSP
Murray Boulevard	Scholls Ferry Road to Barrows Road	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Beaverton TSP

**Figure 1.12  
Motor Vehicle Functional Classification Map (continued)**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
Sandy Boulevard	207 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-84	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Fairview TSP
David Hill Road	Thatcher Road to Sunset Dr (Hwy 47)	No road	Planned minor arterial	Forest Grove TSP
'B' Street (Old Highway 47)	Hwy 47 to Pacific Avenue	Not classified	Minor arterial	Forest Grove TSP
Sunset Drive	Main St. to Hwy 47/ NW Nehalem Highway	Not classified	Collector	Forest Grove TSP
Thatcher Road	David Hill Road to Gales Creek Road	Not classified	Minor arterial	Forest Grove TSP
Riverside Drive Extension			Amend the dashed line to reflect alignment in TSP	Gresham TSP
Railroad Avenue	SE 37 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Not classified	Minor arterial	Milwaukie TSP
Stark Street	Kane Road to UGB	Collector	Minor arterial	Multnomah County Functional Classification Study
SE Clatsop Extension	SE Mt. Scott Boulevard to Deardorf / 132nd Avenue	Future collector of regional significance	Remove from the RTP motor vehicle map or realign south of Willamette National Cemetery boundaries	Portland TSP
SE Flavel Street / Mt. Scott Boulevard	SE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue to the city limits	Minor arterial	Collector of regional significance	Portland TSP
N Interstate Avenue	Fremont Bridge to N Denver Street	Major arterial	Minor arterial	Portland TSP
N Ivanhoe Street	N Philadelphia Avenue to N Lombard Street	Not classified	Minor arterial (should be identified as the US 30 Bypass Route)	Portland TSP
N Richmond Avenue	N Lombard Street to N Ivanhoe Street	Not classified	Minor arterial (should be identified as the US 30 Bypass route)	Portland TSP
Water Avenue On-Ramp	Central Eastside Industrial District	Principal arterial	Delete	Portland TSP



**Figure 1.12  
Motor Vehicle Functional Classification Map (continued)**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
Boones Ferry Rd	SW Norwood Road to Nyberg Street	Minor arterial	Major arterial	Tualatin TSP
Lower Boones Ferry Road	Boones ferry Road to Bridgeport Street	Major arterial	Minor arterial	Tualatin TSP
Martinazzi Avenue	Boones Ferry Road to Tualatin Sherwood	Not classified	Minor arterial	Tualatin TSP
Martinazzi Avenue	Tualatin Sherwood to Pinto Drive to Vermillon Drrive to Stone Drive to Iowa Driver to Boons Ferry Road	Not classified	Collector	Tualatin TSP
Nyberg Street	65 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to Tualatin-Sherwood Road	Minor arterial	Major arterial	Tualatin TSP
Tualatin Sherwood Road	Nyberg Street to Cipole Road	Minor arterial	Major arterial	Tualatin TSP
Grant Street	Brookwood Parkway to 28th Avenue	No Designation	Collector of regional significance	Hillsboro TSP
Beef Bend Road	City of Tigard	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Tigard TSP
Gaarde Street	City of Tigard	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Tigard TSP
Walnut Street	Gaarde Street to Scholls Ferry Road	Collector of regional significance	Minor arterial	Tigard TSP
95th Avenue	Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road	Not Classified	Collector of Regional Significance	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Boeckman Road to Barber Street	No Road	Planned Collector of Regional Significance	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Barber Street to Wilsonville Road	Not Classified	Collector of Regional Significance	Wilsonville TSP
Boeckman Road	Railroad Tracks to 110th Avenue	No Road	Planned Minor Arterial	Wilsonville TSP
Boeckman Road (old Tooze Road)	110th Avenue to Grahams Ferry Road	Not Classified	Minor Arterial	Wilsonville TSP

- Amend Figure 1.16 (Regional Public Transportation System Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.16**  
**Regional Public Transportation System Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
181 <sup>st</sup> Avenue	Gresham	Regional Bus	Frequent Bus	Gresham TSP
I-84 Corridor	Troutdale – Portland	Unclassified	Potential Commuter Rail	Gresham TSP

- Amend Figure 1.17 (Regional Freight System Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.17**  
**Regional Freight System Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
N Lombard Street	N St Louis to N Philadelphia	Road Connector	No designation	STA coordination meeting
McLoughlin Boulevard (Hwy 99E)	Hwy 224 to I-205 south ramps	Main roadway route	Road connector	STA coordination meeting; Main roadway freight route provided by Highway 224 to I-205
N Ivanhoe Street	N St Louis to N Philadelphia	No designation	Road Connector	STA coordination meeting
N St Louis Street	N Lombard to N Ivanhoe	No designation	Road Connector	STA coordination meeting
N Philadelphia Avenue	Lombard to N. Ivanhoe	Road Connector	No designation	ODOT
N. Greeley Avenue	N. Interstate to N. Going	No designation	Road Connector	Portland TSP
Highway 47 Bypass	Tualatin Valley Highway to Sunset	No designation	Main Roadway	ODOT
Tualatin Valley Highway	Hwy 47 bypass to western Forest Grove city limits	Main roadway route	No designation	STA coordination meeting; Freight route provided by Highway 47 bypass
Boones Ferry Road	Day Street to 95th Avenue	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP

**Figure 1.17**  
**Regional Freight System Map (continued)**

Elligsen Road	Boones Ferry Road to Parkway Avenue	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
95th Avenue	Boones Ferry Road to Boeckman Road	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Boeckman Road to Barber Street	No Road	Planned Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Boeckman Road	95th Avenue to Proposed Kinsman Road	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Kinsman Road	Barber Street to Wilsonville Road	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Parkway Avenue	Boeckman Road to Town Center Loop W	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Town Center Loop W	Parkway Avenue to Wilsonville Road	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP
Wilsonville Road	Town Center Loop W to Kinsman Road	Not Classified	Road Connector	Wilsonville TSP

- Amend Figure 1.18 (Regional Bicycle System Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.18**  
**Regional Bicycle System Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
MAX Multi-Use Path	Gresham – Ruby Junction to Cleveland Avenue	None	Regional Corridor Off-street Bikeway	Gresham TSP
Tonquin Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River	None	No change to classification; update off-street bikeway alignments to reflect regional greenspaces plan	Metro Parks and Greenspaces Master Plan
Lower Tualatin River Greenway Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River	None	Same as above	Same as above
Washington Square Regional Center Trail	Washington Square	None	Same as above	Same as above
Oregon City Loop Trail	Willamette River to Clackamas River	None	Same as above	Same as above
Trolley Trail Connector	Springwater Trail to Trolley Trail in Milwaukie	None	Same as above	Same as above
East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	Springwater Trail to Clackamas River	None	Same as above	Same as above
East Buttes Loop Trail	Powell Butte to Gresham	None	Same as above	Same as above
Scouter Mountain Trail Extension	Scouter Mountain Trail to East Buttes Loop Trail	None	Same as above	Same as above

- Amend Figure 1.19 (Regional Pedestrian System Map) as follows:

**Figure 1.19**  
**Regional Pedestrian System Map**

Street Name	Location	Current RTP classification	Proposed RTP classification	Source of change
MAX Multi-Use Path	Gresham– Ruby Junction to Cleveland Avenue	None	Multi-use Facility	Gresham TSP
Tonquin Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River	None	No change to classification; update off-street bikeway alignments to reflect regional greenspaces plan	Metro Parks and Greenspaces Master Plan
Lower Tualatin River Greenway Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River	None	Same as above	Same as above
Washington Square Regional Center Trail	Washington Square	None	Same as above	Same as above
Oregon City Loop Trail	Willamette River to Clackamas River	None	Same as above	Same as above
Trolley Trail Connector	Springwater Trail to Trolley Trail in Milwaukie	None	Same as above	Same as above
East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	Springwater Trail to Clackamas River	None	Same as above	Same as above
East Buttes Loop Trail	Powell Butte to Gresham	None	Same as above	Same as above
Scouter Mountain Trail Extension	Scouter Mountain Trail to East Buttes Loop Trail	None	Same as above	Same as above
General	Region	None	Update pedestrian district boundaries to reflect updated 2040 center boundaries	Metro 2040 Growth Concept

- Amend page 3-7, Figure 3.2 (Regional Trails and Greenways) to add yellow highlight to the following regional trails to indicate trails are also identified in the Regional Bicycle System Map to reflect policy amendments to Figure 1.18 identified in this packet:

<b>Regional Trail Name</b>	<b>Trail Location</b>
MAX Multi-Use Path	Gresham – Ruby Junction to Cleveland Avenue
Tonquin Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Lower Tualatin River Greenway Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Washington Square Regional Center Trail	Washington Square
Oregon City Loop Trail	Willamette River to Clackamas River
Trolley Trail Connector	Springwater Trail to Trolley Trail in Milwaukie
East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	Springwater Trail to Clackamas River
East Buttes Loop Trail	Powell Butte to Gresham
Scouter Mountain Trail Extension	Scouter Mountain Trail to East Buttes Loop Trail

- Amend page 3-9, Figure 3.3 (Existing and Proposed Regional Bicycle System) to add the following regional trails to reflect policy amendments to Figure 1.18 identified in this packet:

<b>Regional Trail Name</b>	<b>Trail Location</b>
MAX Multi-Use Path	Gresham – Ruby Junction to Cleveland Avenue
Tonquin Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Lower Tualatin River Greenway Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Washington Square Regional Center Trail	Washington Square
Oregon City Loop Trail	Willamette River to Clackamas River
Trolley Trail Connector	Springwater Trail to Trolley Trail in Milwaukie
East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	Springwater Trail to Clackamas River
East Buttes Loop Trail	Powell Butte to Gresham
Scouter Mountain Trail Extension	Scouter Mountain Trail to East Buttes Loop Trail

- Amend page 3-11, Figure 3.4 (Existing and Proposed Regional Pedestrian System) to add the following regional trails to reflect policy amendments to Figure 1.19 to reflect policy amendments to Figure 1.19 identified in this packet:

<b>Regional Trail Name</b>	<b>Trail Location</b>
MAX Multi-Use Path	Gresham – Ruby Junction to Cleveland Avenue
Tonquin Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Lower Tualatin River Greenway Trail	Tualatin River to Willamette River
Washington Square Regional Center Trail	Washington Square
Oregon City Loop Trail	Willamette River to Clackamas River
Trolley Trail Connector	Springwater Trail to Trolley Trail in Milwaukie
East Buttes Power Line Corridor Trail	Springwater Trail to Clackamas River
East Buttes Loop Trail	Powell Butte to Gresham
Scouter Mountain Trail Extension	Scouter Mountain Trail to East Buttes Loop Trail

# Text Amendments to Section 1.2 of Chapter 1 of the 2000 RTP

## 1.2 Connecting Land Use and Transportation

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

*Table 1.1*  
**Hierarchy of 2040 Design Types**

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

*Source: Metro*

### 1.2.1 Primary Components

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

#### Central city and regional centers

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

In the 2040 Growth Concept, the central city is highly accessible by a high-quality public transportation system, multi-modal street network and a regional freeway system of through-routes. Light rail lines radiate from the central city, connecting to each regional center. The street system within the central city is designed to encourage public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian travel, but also accommodate auto and freight movement. Of special importance are the bridges that connect the east and west sides of the central city, and serve as critical links in the regional transportation system.

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

#### **Regionally significant industrial areas and intermodal facilities**

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

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

#### **1.2.2 Secondary components**

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

#### **Station communities**

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

### **Town centers and main streets**

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

### **Local industrial areas**

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

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

### **Corridors**

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



# Text Amendments to Table 1.2

**Table 1.2**  
**Regional Motor Vehicle Performance Measures**  
 Deficiency Thresholds and Operating Standards<sup>1</sup>

Location	Mid-Day One-Hour Peak			A.M./P.M. Two-Hour Peak					
	Preferred Operating Standard	Acceptable Operating Standard	Exceeds Deficiency Threshold	Preferred Operating Standard		Acceptable Operating Standard		Exceeds Deficiency Threshold	
				1st Hour	2nd Hour	1st Hour	2nd Hour	1st Hour	2nd Hour
Central City Regional Centers Town Centers Main Streets Station Communities	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
Corridors <u>Regionally Significant</u> <u>Industrial Areas</u> <u>Local Industrial Areas</u> Intermodal Facilities Employment Areas Inner Neighborhoods Outer Neighborhoods	C	D	E	E	D	E	E	F	E
<b>Banfield Freeway<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(from I-5 to I-205)</i>	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
<b>I-5 North*</b> <i>(from Marquam Bridge to Interstate Bridge)</i>	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
<b>Highway 99E<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(from the Central City to Highway 224 interchange)</i>	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
<b>Sunset Highway<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(from I-405 to Sylvan interchange)</i>	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
<b>Stadium Freeway<sup>1</sup></b> <i>(I-5 South to I-5 North)</i>	C	E	F	E	E	F	E	F	F
<b>Other Principal Arterial Routes</b>	C	D	E	E	D	E	E	F	E
<b>Areas of Special Concern</b>	Areas with this designation are planned for mixed used development, but are also characterized by physical, environmental or other constraints that limit the range of acceptable transportation solutions for addressing a level-of-service need, but where alternative routes for regional through-traffic are provided. Figures 1.13.a-e in this chapter define areas where this designation applies. In these areas, substitute performance measures are allowed by OAR.660.012.0060(1)(d). Provisions for determining the alternative performance measures are included in Section 6.7.7 of this plan. Adopted performance measures for these areas are detailed in Appendix 3.3.								

Level-of-service is determined by using either the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board) or through volume to capacity ratio equivalencies as follows: LOS C = .8 or better; LOS D = .8 to .9; LOS E = .9 to 1.0; and LOS F = 1.0 to 1.1. A copy of the level of service tables from the Highway Capacity Manual is shown in Appendix 1.6.

<sup>1</sup> Thresholds shown are for interim purposes only; refinement plans for these corridors are required in Chapter 6 of this plan, and will include a recommended motor vehicle performance policy for each corridor.



# Part 2

## *2000 Regional Transportation Plan Project Amendments*

*April 15, 2004*



**METRO**

PEOPLE PLACES  
OPEN SPACES

# 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Project Amendments

Thank you for taking the time to review proposed amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The amendments are a follow-up to approval of the 2004 interim Federal RTP, and establish consistency between the existing 2000 RTP with the new federal plan. **No major changes to policies or projects are proposed.**

Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document.

## Background

A number of projects identified in the 2004 Interim Federal RTP financially constrained system are not included in the 2000 RTP priority system, which represents the set of projects defined as meeting state rules for adequacy. New transportation projects amended into local plans since adoption of the 2000 RTP are required to be in the 2000 RTP priority system in order to advance to construction.

As a result, amendments to the 2000 RTP Priority System (identified in Chapter 5) are recommended for a limited number of projects to allow these projects to advance toward construction during the period in which separate state and federal RTP documents exist. The proposed amendments are limited to projects that meet the following criteria:

1. Project exists in 2004 RTP Financially Constrained System, and
2. Project exists in a local transportation system plan, local/regional corridor plan or local/ regional master plan that is approved by an elected body, through a public process.

Projects that require goal exceptions findings have not be recommended for inclusion in these amendments.

In addition, several projects have been completed since the adoption of the 2000 RTP. The proposed amendments recommend deleting these projects from the 2000 RTP Priority System.

Finally, project amendments identified in the Powell/Foster Corridor Study – Phase 1 recommendations and approved by Metro Resolution No. 03-3373 are included in the proposed amendments to the 2000 RTP priority system.

## For more information

For more information, call Regional Transportation Planning at (503) 797-1839, or send e-mail to [trans@metro-region.org](mailto:trans@metro-region.org). The hearing impaired can call (503) 797-1804.

## Proposed Amendments to Chapter 5 of 2000 Regional Transportation Plan

- Amend Figure 5.8 (West Columbia Corridor Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-37 through 5-39 **to add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #	Project Name	Project Source and Other Project Comments
4007	Sauvie Island Bridge Replacement	County CIP and Rural TSP. Project is located outside Metro's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Planning Boundary and is not required to be in Metro's RTP. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
4029	PDX ITS	Project is in the Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4044	Columbia/82nd Avenue Improvements	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
4045	Airport Way/122nd Avenue Improvements	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4060	Lightrail station/track realignment	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4082	Ramsey Rail Complex	2003 I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan approved by JPACT and the Metro Council
4084	East Airport Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Improvements	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4085	Terminal area Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4086	PIC Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan
4087	Leadbetter Street Extension and Grade Separation	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
4088	Terminal 4 Driveway Consolidation	Port of Portland's adopted 2004 Port Transportation Improvement Plan. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.

- Amend Figure 5.8 (West Columbia Corridor Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-37 through 5-39 **to delete** the following 2000 RTP Priority System projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

2000 RTP Priority System #	Project Name
4000	Airport LRT
4019	Lightrail station/track realignment
4020	Airport Way Widening, East
4024	Alderwood Road Extension
4025	Cascades Parkway
4027	Airport Way/Cascades grade separation
4047	NE 33rd Avenue Bikeway
4062	Marine Drive Improvements, Phase 1
4080	Swan Island TMA
4081	Columbia Corridor TMA

- Amend Figure 5.9 (Portland Central City Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-43 through 5-47 to **add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #	Project Name	Project Source and Other Project Comments
1022	I-84/Banfield Trail	Portland TSP
1039	SE Belmont Ramp	Portland TSP. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
1057	Eastbank-Springwater Trail Connector (Three Bridges) Improvement	Portland TSP
1082	SE Grand Avenue Bridgehead Improvements	Portland TSP
1089	East Burnside/NE Couch Couplet and Street Improvements	The E Burnside Improvement is identified in the Portland TSP. the solution of a Burnside/Couch couplet as a design change has policy implications because Couch is not identified on the regional system.
1090	W Burnside/NW Couch Couplet and Street Improvements	The W Burnside Improvement is identified in the Portland TSP. However, the solution of a Burnside/Couch couplet as a design change has policy implications because Couch is not identified on the regional system.
1095	Union Station Multi-modal Center Study	Portland TSP
1097	Naito Parkway Street and Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1098	Aerial Tram	Portland TSP
1106	Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 1 (Lloyd District)	City Council resolution directs inclusion of project into Portland TSP as part of next update.
1107	Portland Streetcar - Eastside, Phase 2	City Council resolution directs inclusion of project into Portland TSP as part of next update.

<b>2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Source and Other Project Comments</b>
	(Central Eastside Industrial District)	Portland TSP as part of next update.
1137	Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe Multi-modal Improvements	Portland TSP
1138	Lombard/39th Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
1163	I-205/Powell Boulevard/Division interchanges	Phase 1 Powell/Foster Corridor Study recommendation approved by City of Portland, JPACT and the Metro Council; Also identified as a study in Portland's TSP.
1165	I-205 Ramp Right-of-way Acquisition	Phase 1 Powell/Foster Corridor Study recommendation approved by City of Portland, JPACT and the Metro Council.
1166	Capitol Highway/Vermont/30th Avenue Intersection Improvement	Portland TSP
1167	Capitol Highway Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1173	Hillsdale TC Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1199	Barbur Boulevard Pedestrian Access to Transit Improvements	Portland TSP
1209	NW 23rd Avenue Reconstruction	Portland TSP
1225	Lower Albina Area Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1226	Killingsworth Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1234	Lombard Street Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1235	Prescott Station Area Street Improvements	Portland TSP
1236	NE 15/Jackson Park Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
1237	Fessenden Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
1239	NE Sandy Boulevard ITS	Portland TSP
1252	Inner Powell Streetscape Plan	Portland TSP
1271	Linnton Community Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1277	NW Champlain Viaduct Reconstruction	Portland TSP
1278	SE 39th Avenue Reconstruction, Safety and Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP
1279	Holgate Street Bike and Pedestrian Improvements	Portland TSP

- Amend Figure 5.9 (Portland Central City Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-43 through 5-47 to **delete** the following 2000 RTP Priority System projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

2000 RTP Priority System #	Project Name
1000	Interstate MAX LRT
1014	Central City Street Car
1016	Central City Street Car
1021	Peninsula Crossing Trail
1033	Lovejoy Ramp Removal
1034	Lower Albina RR Crossing
1056	Lloyd District TMA Startup
1058	SW Moody Bikeway
1064	N Interstate Bikeway
1065	SE 17th Avenue Bikeway
1066	SE Milwaukie Bikeway
1079	Steel Bridge Pedestrian Way (RATS Phase I)
1081	Eastbank Esplanade
1144	N Portland Road Bikeway
1145	N St. Louis/Fessenden Bikeway
1146	N Greeley/Interstate Bikeway
1207	Barbur Boulevard ITS
1213	NE/SE 122nd Avenue Bikeway
1217	Multnomah Pedestrian District
1229	Woodstock Mainstreet
1257	NE Russell Bikeway

- Amend Figure 5.10 (East Multnomah County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-51 through 5-53 to **add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #	Project Name	Project Source and Other Project Comments
2029	242nd Avenue Reconstruction	Gresham TSP/County CIP
2039	Regner Road Reconstruction	Gresham TSP
2044	Orient Drive Reconstruction Improvements	Gresham TSP/County CIP
2052	MAX Shared-Use Path (Ruby Junction to Cleveland Station)	Gresham TSP
2076	181st Avenue Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
2099	201st/202nd Avenue Corridor Improvements	Gresham TSP/County CIP
2109	Glisan Street Reconstruction Improvements	Gresham TSP/County CIP
2110	MKC Collector (Halsey St. to Arrata St.)	County CIP/Wood Village TSP/Fairview TSP

<b>2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Source and Other Project Comments</b>
2115	Fairview-Wood Village TC Pedestrian Improvements	Fairview TSP/Wood Village TSP
2120	Sandy Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	County CIP
2125	Troutdale TC Pedestrian Improvements	Troutdale TSP and Town Center Plan

- Amend Figure 5.10 (East Multnomah County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-51 through 5-53 **to delete** the following projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

<b>2000 RTP Priority System #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>
2062	Gresham Regional Center TMA
2068	I-205 Ramps
2079	185th Avenue Railroad Crossing
2086	NE 138th Avenue Improvements
2087	NE 158th Avenue Improvements
2111	207th Avenue Connector

- Amend Figure 5.11 (Pleasant Valley/Damascus Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on page 5-57 **to add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

<b>2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Source and Other Project Comments</b>
7034	Foster Road Extension	Approved by Portland, Gresham, Multnomah County and Metro in Pleasant Valley Concept Plan in 2002. Pleasant Valley Implementation Plan (and TSP amendments) to be adopted by Portland and Gresham in September 2004.
7035	Giese Road Extension	See above comment.
7037	172nd Avenue Improvements (Giese to Butler)	See above comment.
7038	172nd Avenue Improvements (Butler to Cheldelin)	See above comment.
7039	Giese Road Improvements	See above comment.
7040	Giese Road Improvements	See above comment.
7041	Foster Road bridge	See above comment.
7042	Giese Road Extension bridge	See above comment.



- Amend Figure 5.12 (Urban Clackamas County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-61 through 5-64 **to add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

<b>2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Source and Other Project Comments</b>
5020	Highway 213 Improvements	Oregon City TSP
5041	37th Avenue Bike/Ped Improvement	Milwaukie TSP
5052	17th Avenue Trolley Trail Connector	Metro Greenspaces Master Plan and Clackamas TSP
5070	Otty Road Improvements to add turn lanes	Clackamas TSP
5076	Fuller Road Improvements to add turn lanes	Clackamas TSP
5087	West Sunnybrook Road Extension	Clackamas TSP
5098	King Road Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
5099	Webster Road Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
5126	Oregon City South Amtrak Station Phase 2	Oregon City TSP/Oregon City CIP
5142	Mollala Avenue Frequent Bus Improvements	TriMet TIP
5171	Lake Oswego Transit Station Project	Lake Oswego TSP
5199	I-205 Auxiliary Lanes (I-5 to Stafford Road)	Tualatin TSP. Under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
5207	Mt. Scott Creek Trail	2000 RTP Bicycle and Pedestrian System Map designation.

- Amend Figure 5.12 (Urban Clackamas County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-61 through 5-64 **to delete** the following projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

<b>2000 RTP Priority System #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>
5018	Highway 213 Intersection Improvements
5022	Highway 213 Widening
5038	Johnson Creek Boulevard, Phase 2
5046	Railroad Crossing Improvements
5065	Clackamas Regional Center TMA Startup
5108	Jennifer Street/135th Avenue Extension
5130	99E/2nd Avenue Realignment
5163	"A" Avenue Reconstruction

- Amend Figure 5.13 (South Washington County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-67 through 5-70 **to add** the following 2004 Interim Federal RTP Financially Constrained System projects to the 2000 RTP Priority System:

<b>2004 RTP Financially Constrained System Project #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Source and Other Project Comments</b>
6011	Highway 217 Overcrossing - Cascade Plaza	Tigard TSP
6035	Gaarde Street Improvements	Tigard TSP
6057	Washington Square Regional Center Greenbelt Shared Use Path	Tigard TSP. Funded for construction from Hall to Highway 217 and for PE west to Greenburg Rd. through the 2004-07 MTIP. Extension of the trail from Highway 217 to Greenburg with a pedestrian overpass or underpass of Highway 217 is unfunded.
6065	Herman Road Improvements	Tualatin TSP
6076	Myslony/112th Connection	Tualatin TSP
6088	Elligsen Road Improvements	Wilsonville TSP
6093	Barber Street Extension	Wilsonville TSP
6138	Wilsonville Road/I-5 Interchange Improvements (Phase 1 and 2)	Wilsonville TSP. Phase 1 under consideration for OTIA 3 funding.
6142	Upper Boones Ferry Road Improvement	Washington County TSP identifies Boones Ferry as a 2 or 3 lane roadway for ROW acquisition, but not construction

- Amend Figure 5.13 (South Washington County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-67 through 5-70 **to delete** the following projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

<b>2000 RTP Priority System #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>
6014	Greenburg Road Improvements
6033	Walnut Street Improvements, Phase 1
6046	Walnut Street Improvements, Phase 2
6059	Beef Bend Road Improvements
6072	Tualatin Road Improvements
6111	Beef Bend/Elsner Road Improvements
6113	Oregon Street Improvements
6125	Bangy Road Improvements
6128	Carmen Drive Intersection Improvements

- Amend Figure 5.14 (North Washington County Subarea) and corresponding project descriptions on pages 5-73 through 5-77 **to delete** the following projects because they have been completed or are under construction:

2000 RTP Priority System #	Project Name
3007	US 26 Improvements
3026	Millikan Extension
3027	Davis Improvements
3028	Hart Improvements
3085	170th Improvement
3108	Baseline Road Improvements
3110	Jackson School Road Improvements
3130	Evergreen Road Improvements
3132	Cornelius Pass Road Improvements
3136	Brookwood/Parkway Avenue Improvements
3138	Murray LRT Overcrossing and Pedestrian Improvements
3152	Westside TMA
3154	Forest Grove Northern Arterial

- Amend Chapter 5 to incorporate the following Powell/Foster Corridor Study – Phase 1 recommendations (as approved in Metro Resolution No. 03-3373):
  - On page 5-51, delete the description of Project 1164 and replace with “I-205 Ramp Study - Perform a design study to evaluate modifications to the existing overpass at I-205 and Powell Boulevard, including full access ramps to and from I-205. The study should also address impacts to the interchange influence area along Powell Boulevard, Division Street, and SE 92<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.”
  - On page 5-51, delete the description of project number 1163 and replace with “I-205/Powell Boulevard Interchange - Construct improvements to allow full turn movements at the Powell Boulevard and I-205 interchange.”
  - On page 5-46, delete the description of project 1228 and replace with “Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Study Phase 2 -Conduct the next phase of a corridor study that develops multi-modal transportation strategies and specific roadway, bicycle and pedestrian projects that provide access to Pleasant Valley, Damascus, and the Urban Growth Boundary expansion areas. As part of the Phase 2 Powell/Foster Corridor Study, complete 1) a design study of the appropriate cross-section for Foster Road from SE Barbara Welch Road to Jenne Road, 2) a refinement plan of the design options for Highland Drive and Pleasant View Drive, and 3) complete a project development study of a new extension of SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Jenne and the future Giese Roads. The study may result in an amendment to planning documents to call for a new extension of SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue in lieu of widening Jenne Road to three lanes between Foster Road and Powell Boulevard (former project 7007).”
  - On page 5-46, add a new RTP project description and project number as follows, “Powell Boulevard Project Development Study Perform a project development

study on Powell Boulevard from I-205 and SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue, with a short-term time frame. Based on costs and timing of needs, the study will develop a phased construction schedule.”

- On page 5-52, delete the description of project 2049 and replace with “Powell Boulevard Improvements - Widen the street to five lanes including sidewalks and bike lanes from SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue to SW Duniway Avenue. Include mid-block pedestrian crossings west of SE 182<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and at SW Duniway Avenue. Improvements at the intersection of SE 182<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Powell Boulevard will include bus pullouts on Powell. Widen the street to three lanes with a raised landscaped median including sidewalks and bike lanes from SW Duniway Avenue to NW Birdsdale Avenue. Widen the street to an imbalanced four-lane cross section including sidewalks and bike lanes from NW Birdsdale Avenue to NW Eastman Parkway, with two westbound travel lanes, a center turn lane and one eastbound travel lane.”
- On page 5-52, delete the description of project 2045 (190<sup>th</sup>/Highland Drive Improvements), and on page 5-57, and delete the project description for project 7012 (Highland Corridor Plan). Replace project 2045 with “2045 190<sup>th</sup> Avenue Improvements - Reconstruct and widen 190<sup>th</sup> Avenue to five lanes from Highland Drive to Butler Road with sidewalks and bike lanes. Widen and determine the appropriate cross-section for Highland Drive and Pleasant View Drive from Powell Boulevard to 190<sup>th</sup> Avenue based on the recommendations from Phase 2 of the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Study.”
- On page 5-57, delete the description of project 7006 and replace with “SE Foster Road Improvements - Widen Foster Road to four lanes from SE 122<sup>nd</sup> to SE Barbara Welch Road. Widen and determine the appropriate cross section of Foster Road from SE Barbara Welch Road to Jenne Road by completing Phase 2 of the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Study in order to meet roadway, transit, pedestrian and bike needs.”
- On page 5-57, delete the description of project 7007 (SE Jenne Road Improvements) and replace with “SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue/North-South Capacity Improvements - Based on the recommendations from the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Study (1228), construct a new north-south capacity improvement project in the vicinity of SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Jenne Road between SE Powell Boulevard and Giese Road in Pleasant Valley. This replaces former project 7007 which widened Jenne Road to three lanes from Powell Boulevard to Foster Road.”
- On page 5-57, delete project 7016 (Jenne Road Traffic Management Plan). This project is included in Project #7007.



# Part 3

## *2000 Regional Transportation Plan Technical Amendments*

*April 15, 2004*



**METRO**  
PEOPLE PLACES  
OPEN SPACES

# 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Technical Amendments

Thank you for taking the time to review proposed amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The amendments are a follow-up to approval of the 2004 interim Federal RTP, and establish consistency between the existing 2000 RTP with the new federal plan. **No major changes to policies or projects are proposed.**

Because the amendments to the 2000 RTP represent more of a "housekeeping" effort, the emphasis in the public comment period will be on the proposed changes to the plan, not the overall 2000 RTP document.

## Summary of Technical Amendments

Since the last RTP update, a number of corridor studies and concept plans for new urban areas have been completed, and approved by local or regional officials, or are about to be completed. The results of these studies include a number of technical changes to the RTP implementation chapter that frame future work that must still be completed, and delete technical requirements that have been addressed by these studies. The changes reflected in the technical amendments include:

- Powell-Foster Corridor Study – Phase I Recommendations
- I-5 South – Wilsonville Area Study
- Regional Travel Option Strategic Planning
- RTP Modal Target Study
- Damascus/Boring Concept Plan

The technical amendments are shown in strikethrough and underscore.

## For more information

For more information, call Regional Transportation Planning at (503) 797-1839, or send e-mail to [trans@metro-region.org](mailto:trans@metro-region.org). The hearing impaired can call (503) 797-1804.

## 2000 RTP Chapter 6 Technical Amendments

- **Amend Chapter 6 as shown in strikethrough/underscore:**

### Section 6.1.2 Air Quality Conformity: Criteria that Constitutes a Conformed Plan

The ~~2020~~2025 Preferred Illustrative and Priority Systems ~~both~~ requires new revenue sources and go beyond federal requirements that long-range transportation plans be based upon "constrained resources." Air quality conformity of this plan will be based on a scaled-down ~~2020~~2025 Priority Illustrative System that can likely be implemented within the federally defined fiscally constrained level of reasonably available resources. This system will be termed the ~~2020~~2025 Fiscally Financially Constrained System. Air quality conformity entails:

- Making reasonable progress on Transportation Control Measures as identified in the SIP
- Staying within the carbon monoxide and ozone emissions budgets set for transportation with the SIP based upon a fiscally constrained transportation network

Portland is currently designated a maintenance area for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone and carbon monoxide under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

### Section 6.1.3 Demonstration of Air Quality Conformity

~~The Financially Constrained System and the 2020 Priority System have been found to conform to federal air quality requirements.~~ Appendix 4.0 provides detailed information ~~to support this finding on the air quality conformity analysis to be completed on the 2025 Financially Constrained System.~~

### Section 6.7.5 Type I – Major Corridor Refinements

*Interstate-5 South (Highway 217 to ~~Wilsonville~~Willamette River/Boones Bridge)*

This facility serves as the major southern access to and from the central city. The route also serves as an important freight corridor, where Willamette Valley traffic enters the region at the Wilsonville "gateway," and provides access to Washington County via Highway 217. Projections for this facility indicate that growth in traffic between the Metro region and the Willamette Valley will account for as much as 80 percent of the traffic volume along the southern portion of I-5, in the Tualatin and Wilsonville area. . A joint ODOT and Wilsonville study<sup>1</sup> concludes that in 2030 widening of I-5 to eight lanes would be required to meet interstate freeway capacity standards set by Metro and ODOT and that freeway access capacity would not be adequate with an improved I-5/Wilsonville Road interchange. For ~~this~~these reasons, the appropriate improvements in this corridor are unclear at this time. However, I-5 serves as a critical gateway for regional travel and commerce, and an acceptable transportation strategy in this corridor has statewide significance. A major corridor study is proposed to address the following issues:

---

<sup>1</sup> [I-5/Wilsonville Freeway Access Study, DKS Associates, November 2002](#)

- [the effects of widening I-205 on the I-5 South corridor](#)
- [the effects of the I-5 to 99W Connector on the Stafford Road interchange and the resultant need for increased freeway access](#)
- [the effects of peak period congestion in this area on regional freight mobility and travel patterns](#)
- the ability of inter-city transit service, to/from neighboring cities in the Willamette Valley, including commuter rail, to slow traffic growth in the I-5 corridor
- the ability to maintain off-peak freight mobility with capacity improvements
- the potential for better coordination between the Metro region and valley jurisdictions on land-use policies
- the effects of a planned long-term strategy for managing increased travel along I-5 in the Willamette Valley
- [the effects of UGB expansion and Industrial Lands Evaluation studies on regional freight mobility](#)
- [the effects to freight mobility and local circulation due to diminished freeway access capacity in the I-5/Wilsonville corridor](#)

In addition, the following design elements should be considered as part of the corridor study:

- peak period pricing and HOV lanes for expanded capacity
- provide rapid bus service on parallel Barbur route, connecting Wilsonville to the central city
- provide additional overcrossings in West Portland town center to improve local circulation and interchange access
- [provide additional freeway access improvements in the I-5/Wilsonville corridor to improve freight mobility and local circulation, \(e.g. a new Boeckman Road interchange\)](#)
- add capacity to parallel arterial routes, including 72nd Avenue, Boones Ferry, Lower Boones Ferry and Carmen Drive
- add overcrossings in vicinity of Tigard Triangle to improve local circulation
- extend commuter rail service from Salem to the central city, Tualatin transit center and Milwaukie, primarily along existing heavy rail tracks
- [additional I-5 mainline capacity \(2030 demand on I-5 would exceed capacity\)](#)
  - [provision of auxiliary lanes between all I-5 freeway on- and off-ramps in Wilsonville](#)



### *Powell Boulevard/Foster Road*

The concentration potential urban growth boundary expansions in Clackamas County and southeast Multnomah County will place heavy demands on connecting routes that link these areas with employment centers in Portland and Multnomah County. Of these routes, the Foster/Powell corridor is most heavily affected, yet is also physically constrained by slopes and the Johnson Creek floodplain, making capacity improvements difficult. More urban parts of Foster and Powell Boulevard are equally constrained by existing development, and the capacity of the Ross Island Bridge.

As a result, a corridor study is needed to explore the potential for high capacity transit strategies that provide access from the developing Pleasant Valley and Damascus areas to employment areas along the Foster/Powell corridor, Gresham regional center, Columbia South Shore industrial area and central city. Such a study should consider the following transportation solutions:

- aggressive transit improvements, including rapid bus service from Central City to Damascus town center via Powell and Foster roads, and primary bus on 172nd Avenue and to the Gresham regional center, Eastside MAX and Columbia South Shore
- capacity improvements that would expand Foster Road from two to three lanes from 122nd to 172nd avenues, and from two to five lanes from 172nd Avenue to Highway 212, phased in coordination with planned capacity improvements to Powell Boulevard between I-205 and Eastman Parkway
- extensive street network connection improvements in the Mount Scott and Pleasant Valley areas to reduce local travel demand on Foster Road and Powell Boulevard, and to improve access between these areas and adjacent East Multnomah and northeast Clackamas Counties
- ITS or other system management approaches to better accommodate expected traffic growth on the larger southeast Portland network, East Multnomah and northeast Clackamas County network

### **Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Phase 2**

The Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor represents both a key transportation challenge and an opportunity to meet 2040 regional land use goals. The Powell/Foster Corridor is a top priority among corridors requiring refinement plans. Despite policy changes to level-of-service standards that permit greater levels of congestion, significant multi-modal improvements will be needed in order to continue to serve transportation needs of the communities and industrial areas in southeast Portland and Gresham. The corridor is also critical to providing access to the planned growth areas in Pleasant Valley, along with Damascus and Springwater that have recently been added to the Urban Growth Boundary. In addition, the corridor is constrained by significant topographical and environmental features.

As a result of the findings from Phase 1 of the Powell Boulevard/Foster Road Corridor Plan, which was completed in 2003, specific multi-modal projects have been identified that address transportation needs on Powell Boulevard between inner SE Portland and Gresham, and on Foster Road west of Barbara Welch Road. System level decisions for transit service were also made for the corridor.

Several outstanding transportation problems in the Pleasant Valley, Damascus and south Gresham areas, require additional planning work before specific multi-modal projects can be developed and implemented. The Phase 2 plan should closely coordinated with concept plans for Damascus and the Springwater area, in order to incorporate the updated land use and transportation assumptions. It should examine the following transportation solutions and strategies:

- Determine the appropriate cross section on Foster Road between Barbara Welch Road and Jenne Road and the project timing, to meet roadway, transit, pedestrian and bike needs.
- Explore possibilities for potential new street connection improvements in the Mount Scott area that reduce local travel demand on Foster Road and improve access to the Pleasant Valley area.
- Develop conceptual designs and determine right-of-way for an improvement and extension of SE 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Powell Boulevard and Giese Road, or another new north-south roadway in the area, to accommodate travel demand and improve access to Pleasant Valley. The alignment should consider engineering feasibility, land use and environmental affects, safety, and overall costs.
- Further define the three-lane Highland Drive and Pleasant View Drive option that was recommended as part of Phase 1. This option needs to address design, operational, and safety-related issues.
- Work with local jurisdictions to provide for access management on arterials serving Pleasant Valley and Damascus.
- Address other regional north-south transportation needs identified by the Damascus Concept Plan and Springwater concept planning effort. Further evaluate alignment issues, engineering cost estimates, and right-of-way impacts of future roadway projects north of Damascus that are identified as part of the concept planning effort.

#### **6.7.7 Areas of Special Concern**

##### *Gateway Regional Center*

Gateway is at a major transportation crossroads, and suffers and benefits from the level of access that results. The Preferred System analysis shows that from the perspective of employers looking at labor markets, the Gateway area is the most accessible place in the Metro region. At the same time, spillover traffic from the Banfield Freeway corridor exceeds the LOS policy established in Table 1.2 on a number of east/west corridors in the Gateway area, including Halsey, Glisan, Burnside, Stark and Division streets.

The local TSP should examine the ability of local streets in these areas to absorb travel demand to a degree that cannot be measured in the regional model. A traffic management plan for these streets should be integrated with the overall TSP strategy, but should establish specific action plans and benchmarks for facilities determined to exceed the LOS policy in the local analysis. Alternative mode

choices should be identified to further reduce travel demand. The local TSP should also consider strategies for providing better access to LRT, including park and ride facilities at station areas.

## Section 6.8 Outstanding Issues

The section describes a number of outstanding issues that could not be addressed at the time of adoption of this plan, but should be addressed in future updates to the RTP.

### 6.8.2 ~~Damascus/Boring-Pleasant Valley TCSP Concept Planning~~

~~Metro was recently awarded a special federal TCSP grant from the US Department of Transportation to complete an urban reserve plan for the Damascus-Pleasant Valley area of Clackamas County. The work scope for the project is broad, encompassing land use, transportation, and environmental planning. The project is scheduled to begin in early 2000. The objective of the study is to prepare concept plans for this large urban reserve area in anticipation of future urbanization. Metro will work with a number of local partners to complete the project, including the cities of Portland, Gresham and Happy Valley, and Multnomah and Clackamas counties. A citizen policy advisory committee that includes residents and key stakeholders will guide the project.~~

~~The Damascus-Pleasant Valley planning effort will include conceptual transportation planning for regional facilities in the area, and more detailed street planning for northern portions of the area that are already included in the urban area. Transportation and land use scenarios will be developed to reflect a variety of land use alternatives for the area, and will be analyzed with the regional transportation model.~~

~~The preferred alternative will likely include refinements to the Damascus-Pleasant Valley street functional classifications and transportation improvements included in this plan.~~

~~Metro received federal grant money for the purpose of completing a concept plan for a new urban area in the Damascus/Boring area. Clackamas County and Metro will jointly develop the concept plan, with the assistance of a Contractor and the participation of area citizens, key organizations, service providers and cities. ODOT will also participate in the process. The concept planning is anticipated to start in winter of 2003, will take approximately two years to complete. There will be extensive public involvement during this process.~~

~~The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will be a cooperative planning effort to create plan and implementation strategies for development of approximately 12,000 acres located south of Gresham and east of Happy Valley in Clackamas County. The concept plan is a follow-up to a December 2002 decision by Metro to bring the area inside the Urban Growth Boundary. The Damascus/Boring Concept plan will be closely coordinated with the environmental analysis of the Sunrise Corridor Unit 1 effort and will address the general need, modes, function, and location of the proposed Sunrise Corridor Unit 2. Important components of the concept plan are expected to include:~~

- ~~• A land-use element that locates a combination of uses and densities that support local and regional housing and employment needs, provides a diverse range of housing, and identifies commercial and industrial employment opportunities that allow residents to work near their home~~

- A multi-modal transportation system element that serves interstate, regional and community travel needs and informs the Sunrise Corridor Unit 2 planning process
- A natural resources element that identifies natural resource areas and protection strategies
- A public infrastructure and facilities element for water, sewer, storm water, parks, schools, fire and police

The concept plan will provide the basis for future comprehensive plan amendments and development code regulations that must be adopted before development can take place. The Damascus/Boring Concept Plan will identify and evaluate multi-modal transportation system alternatives to serve regional and community needs in the area. The alternatives will include combinations of highway, arterial, boulevard and transit improvements that are complemented by a network of local streets, multi-use trails and bicycle and pedestrian connections. If the Damascus/Boring Concept Plan reaffirms that Sunrise Corridor Unit 2 improvements are needed, the concept plan will identify transportation alternatives to be evaluated through a future DEIS process similar to that already initiated for the Unit 1 portion of the Sunrise Corridor.

Proposed amendments to the RTP would be considered upon completion of the study, which is scheduled to conclude in Fall 2002. The preferred alternative will also include future street plans for some local streets that may be incorporated into local TSPs.

#### **6.8.9 TDM Program Enhancements**

The TDM Subcommittee is in the process of developing a 3-5 year strategic plan that clearly articulates a new vision and proposed direction for the Regional Travel Options program. The strategic direction is to develop a more collaborative marketing program that eliminates duplication of marketing effort and that delivers a clear message to all of our customers (students, commuters, aging population, shoppers, etc). The regional evaluation program will also become more collaborative as we work to develop performance measure and evaluate progress toward non-SOV modal targets for regional centers and industrial areas. The strategic plan will update TDM policies resulting in RTP Amendments that reflect new strategies for promoting travel options to the region.

In addition, the TDM program should be continually updated to include new strategies for regional demand management. One such strategy that should be considered is the Location Efficient Mortgage (LEM). The LEM is a mortgage product that increases the borrowing power of potential homebuyers in "location efficient" neighborhoods. Location efficient neighborhoods are pedestrian friendly areas with easy access to public transit, shopping, employment and schools. The LEM recognizes that families can save money by living in location efficient neighborhoods because the need to travel by car is reduced. Instead of owning two cars, a family living in a location efficient neighborhood could get by with one - or none. The LEM requires bankers to look at the average monthly amount of money that applicants would be spending on transportation if they had to use a car for day-to-day transport and applies it to the servicing of a larger mortgage. This increases the purchasing power of borrowers when buying a home in location efficient neighborhoods, stimulating home purchases in existing urban areas.

#### **6.8.14 RTP Modal Targets Implementation**

Metro was recently awarded state Transportation/Growth Management funds to identify best practices and further clarify what constitutes a minimum requirements for local transportation system plans to meet the RTP modal targets. Metro's primary goal is to ensure that the planning programs be adopted, and that on-the-ground progress be demonstrated over time. However, progress toward the non-SOV

modal targets is an output of the regional travel demand model, but cannot be generated by local jurisdictions. Progress would be periodically evaluated as part of RTP updates. The project will:

- Identify best practices and minimum requirements for local governments to demonstrate that local TSPs can meet non-SOV mode split targets in the RTP. Meeting this objective will allow Metro to ensure RTP compliance with Section 660-012-0035(5) of the Transportation Planning Rule.
- Ensure that minimum requirements identified are reasonably sufficient to enable local jurisdictions to achieve the Non SOV Modal Targets of Table 1.3 and the Alternative Mode Analysis of section 6.4.6 of the RTP.
- Ensure that minimum requirements identified can be carried out by Metro and/or local jurisdictions without a significant commitment of staff time or other resources.
- Provide education on the benefits of reducing non-SOV mode trips.

This effort could result in amendments to the RTP.

#### **6.8.15 Defining System Adequacy**

Section 660.012.0060 of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requires local governments to evaluate amendments to acknowledged plans and regulations to ensure that the changes are consistent with planned transportation improvements. For the Metro region, the RTP currently defines the “priority” system of improvements for major transportation facilities as the basis for evaluating such amendments.

Prior to the next update to the 2000 RTP, the issue of defining an adequate system of improvements for the purpose of evaluating local plan amendments should be addressed in detail to ensure a balance between allowing desired development and preventing land use actions that outstrip the public ability to provide transportation infrastructure. This effort should include a cross-section of local and regional interests and state agency officials, and could lead to recommended RTP amendments that implement a new strategy for considering such proposals. The effort should be led jointly by Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

### **6.8.16 Wilsonville I-5 South Corridor**

Based on the results of the I-5/Wilsonville Freeway Access Study (DKS Associates, November 2002, prepared for ODOT and the City of Wilsonville, with Metro's participation), there will be a future deficiency for freeway access capacity in Wilsonville based on year 2020 PM peak forecasts. Improvements were identified in the City of Wilsonville's 2003 Transportation Systems Plan to address this deficiency, but did not include the effects of the planned southern alignment for the I-5 to 99W Connector to the Stafford Road Interchange, the plans for which were outside of the scope of the TSP. The improvements include an improved local street system in Wilsonville, freeway access improvements and I-5 operational improvements. Improvements to the local roadway system are not adequate by themselves to mitigate the future 2020 interchange access needs without interchange improvements. In evaluating two freeway access improvement alternatives (an enhanced Wilsonville Road diamond interchange and a new Boeckman Road interchange to I-5) it was found that improvements to the Wilsonville Road interchange would be necessary with either interchange alternative. Based upon the findings of study, an enhanced Wilsonville Road diamond interchange, currently in preliminary engineering, is needed to meet future 2020 capacity demands. Implementation of the enhanced Wilsonville Road diamond interchange project depends upon funding availability.

The analysis of future freeway access needs was conducted with a wide range of travel forecasts, assessing the sensitivity of the findings in the 2020 PM peak period with various travel demand assumptions. In each case, the findings noted above were found to be consistent in terms of the required first step being the enhanced Wilsonville Road diamond interchange. However, utilizing an approximation technique to extend 2020 forecasts to 2030, it was found that in 2030 widening of I-5 to eight lanes would be required to meet interstate freeway capacity standards set by Metro and ODOT and that freeway access capacity would not be adequate with the improved I-5/Wilsonville Road interchange and further access improvements would be necessary. Thus, other freeway access improvements (e.g. a new Boeckman Road interchange) must be considered in future regional capacity studies, including the Regional Transportation Plan update, I-5 South Corridor Study, I-5 to 99W Connector and/or a Stafford/I-205 Study in conjunction with possible urban growth boundary expansions and industrial land evaluations.

### **6.8.17 National Highway System (NHS) Routes Update**

A component of the federal requirements that warrants special effort is a needed update to the National Highway System (NHS) designations in the RTP. These routes were originally designated in the early 1990s, and are due for an update that considers 2040 land use and transportation considerations that have since been adopted into regional and local plans. This effort will occur prior to the next RTP update.

# How to comment on the amendments to the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan

The public comment period for the amendments begins on April 15, 2004 and ends at noon on June 1, 2004. You may submit comments online at Metro's website:

**[www.metro-region.org/rtp](http://www.metro-region.org/rtp)**

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

## Comments:

<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
-------------------------------------------------

## Submitted by:

<hr/>	
<i>Name</i>	
<hr/>	<hr/>
<i>Street Address</i>	<i>City/Zip</i>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<i>Phone</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>
<b>Send me more info:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>2000 RTP Document CD</i>	<i>Other RTP Info:</i> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>2004 Interim Federal RTP Document CD</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please add me to the RTP interested citizens mailing/e-mail lists</i>	

# 2000 Regional Transportation Plan Amendments Calendar

<b>April 15</b>	Public comment period begins; staff recommendation on 2000 RTP amendments released for 45-day public comment period
<b>April 22</b>	Metro Council first reading of Ordinance on draft 2004 RTP
<b>May 13</b>	Metro Council public hearing on amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan
<b>June 1</b>	Public comment period ends at noon
<b>June 2</b>	MTAC review and discussion of amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan
<b>June 25</b>	TPAC review and discussion of amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan
<b>June 9</b>	Tentative final MPAC action on amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan
<b>July 8</b>	Tentative final JPACT action on amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan
<b>July 8</b>	Metro Council second reading of Ordinance and consideration of adoption of amendments to 2000 Regional Transportation Plan

*FOLD HERE*

---



**METRO**

Place first  
class  
postage  
here.

Metro  
600 NE Grand Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97232  
Attention: Kim Ellis



BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE ) ORDINANCE NO. 04-1040  
METRO URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY, )  
THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN AND )  
THE METRO CODE TO INCREASE THE )  
CAPACITY OF THE BOUNDARY TO )  
ACCOMMODATE GROWTH IN ) Introduced by the Metro Council  
INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT )

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 02-969B (For The Purpose Of Amending The Urban Growth Boundary, The Regional Framework Plan And The Metro Code In Order To Increase The Capacity Of The Boundary To Accommodate Population Growth To The Year 2022), the Council amended Title 4 (Industrial and Other Employment Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to increase the capacity of industrial land to accommodate industrial jobs; and

WHEREAS, by Ordinance No. 02-969B, the Council added capacity to the UGB but did not add sufficient capacity to accommodate the full need for land for industrial use; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council submitted Ordinance No. 969B, in combination with other ordinances that increased the capacity of the UGB, to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) as part of Metro's periodic review of the capacity of its UGB; and

WHEREAS, on July 7, 2003, LCDC issued its 'Partial Approval and Remand Order 03-WKTASK-001524' that approved most of the Council's decisions, but returned the matter to the Council for completion or revision of three tasks: (1) provide complete data on the number, density and mix of housing types and determine the need for housing types over the next 20 years; (2) add capacity to the UGB for the unmet portion of the need for land for industrial use; and (3) either remove tax lots 1300, 1400 and 1500 in Study Area 62 from the UGB or justify their inclusion; and

WHEREAS, the Council completed its analysis of the number, density and mix of housing types and the need for housing over the planning period 2002-2022 and incorporated its conclusions in a revision to its Housing Needs Analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Council increased the capacity of the UGB both by adding land to the UGB and by revising the Regional Framework Plan and Title 4 of the UGMFP to meet the previously unmet portion of the need for land for industrial use; and

WHEREAS, the Council decided to remove tax lots 1300, 1400 and 1500 in Study Area 62 from the UGB; and

WHEREAS, the Council consulted its Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee and the 24 cities and three counties of the metropolitan region and considered comments and suggestions prior to making this decision; and

WHEREAS, prior to making this decision, the Council sent individual mailed notification to more than 100,000 households in the region and held public hearings on Title 4 and the efficient use of industrial land on December 4 and 11, 2003, public workshops at six locations around the region in March, 2004, on possible amendments to the UGB, and public hearings on the entire matter on April 22 and 29, May 6, and June 10 and 24, 2004; now, therefore

THE METRO COUNCIL HEREBY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Policy 1.12 of the Regional Framework Plan is hereby amended, as indicated in Exhibit A, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, to guide the choice of farmland for addition to the UGB when no higher priority land is available or suitable.
2. Title 4 (Industrial and Other Employment Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan is hereby amended, as indicated in Exhibit B, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, to improve implementation of Title 4 by cities and counties in the region.
3. The Employment and Industrial Areas Map is hereby amended, as shown in Exhibit C, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, to depict the boundaries of Regionally Significant Industrial Areas pursuant to Policy 1.4.1 of the Regional Framework Plan in order to ensure more efficient use of the areas for industries reliant upon the movement of freight and to protect the function and capacity of freight routes and connectors in the region.
4. The Revised Housing Needs Analysis, January 24, 2003, is hereby further revised, as indicated in Exhibit D, Addendum to Housing Needs Analysis, April 5, 2004, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, to comply with the first item in LCDC's "Partial Approval and Remand Order 03-WKTASK-001524."
5. The Metro UGB is hereby amended to include all or portions of the Study Areas shown on Exhibit E and more precisely identified in the Industrial Land Alternative Analysis Study, February, 2004, Item (c) in Appendix A, subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit F, and to exclude tax lots 1300, 1400 and 1500 in Study Area 62 and the southeast portion of Study Area 9

from the UGB, also shown on Exhibit E and more precisely identified in the Staff Report, 'In Consideration of Ordinance No. 04-1040, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to increase the capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment', Item (a) in Appendix A. Exhibits E and F are attached and incorporated into this ordinance to comply with the second and third items in LCDC's 'Partial Approval and Remand Order 03-WKTASK-001524.'

6. The Appendix, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, is hereby adopted in support of the amendments to the UGB, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code in sections 1 through 3 of this ordinance. The following documents comprise the Appendix:
  - a. Staff Report, 'In Consideration of Ordinance No. 04-1040, For the Purpose of Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code to increase the capacity of the Boundary to Accommodate Growth in Industrial Employment', April 5, 2004.
  - b. 2002-2022 Urban Growth Report: An Employment Land Need Analysis, June 24, 2004 Supplement.
  - c. Industrial Land Alternative Analysis Study, February, 2004.
  - d. Measure 26-29 Technical Report: Assessment of the Impacts of the June, 2004, UGB Expansion on Property Owners.
  - e. Industrial Land Expansion Public Comment Report, March, 2004.
  - f. 'An Assessment of Potential Regionally Significant Industrial Areas', memorandum from Mary Weber to Dick Benner, October 21, 2003.
  - g. 'Recommended Factors for Identifying RSIA's', memorandum from Mary Weber to MTAC, June 30, 2003.
  - h. 'Slopes Constraints on Industrial Development', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, November 25, 2003.
  - i. 'Limited Choices: The Protection of Agricultural Lands and the Expansion of the Metro Area Urban Growth Boundary for Industrial Use', prepared by the Metro Agricultural Lands Technical Workgroup, April, 2004.
  - j. 'Technical Assessment of Reducing Lands within Alternatives Analysis Study Areas', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, October 30, 2003.
  - k. Agriculture at the Edge: A Symposium, October 31, 2003, Summary by Kimi Iboshi Sloop, December, 2003.
  - m. 'Industrial Land Aggregation Methodology, Test and Results', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, September 24, 2003.
  - n. 'Industrial Areas Requested by Local Jurisdictions', memorandum from Tim O'Brien to Lydia Neill, July 29, 2003.

- o. 'Industrial Land Locational and Siting Factors', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, June 9, 2003.
  - p. 'A Review of Information Pertaining to Regional Industrial Lands', memorandum from Dick Benner to David Bragdon, January 26, 2004.
  - q. Map of Freight Network and Freight Facilities, Metro, November, 2003.
  - r. 'Evaluating the Industrial Land Supply with Projected Demand', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, May 14, 2003.
  - s. 'Identifying 2003 Industrial Land Alternatives Analysis Study Areas', memorandum from Tim O'Brien to Lydia Neill, July 9, 2003.
  - t. 'For the Purpose of Reducing the Land Under Consideration in the 2002 and 2003 Alternatives Analysis for Meet the Remaining Need for Industrial Land through Urban Growth Boundary Expansion', Staff Report, November 18, 2003.
  - u. 'Formation of Industrial Neighborhoods', memorandum from Lydia Neill to David Bragdon, October 24, 2003.
  - v. 'Developed Lots 5 Acres and Smaller Outside the UGB', memorandum from Amy Rose to Lydia Neill, November 18, 2003.
  - w. 'Employment Land Included in the 2002 Urban Growth Boundary Expansion', memorandum from Andy Cotugno to David Bragdon, March 10, 2003.
  - x. 'Identifying Additional Land for Industrial Purposes', memorandum from Tim O'Brien to Lydia Neill, March 7, 2003.
7. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Exhibit G, attached and incorporated into this ordinance, explain how this ordinance complies with state law, the Regional Framework Plan and the Metro Code.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 24<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

ATTEST:

Approved as to Form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christina Billington, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney